Threat, risk or business as usual?
Securitization of Russian energy in Finland, Germany and Poland after the Ukraine crisis

Otto Kaplas
University of Helsinki
Faculty of Social Sciences
Democracy and Global Transformations
Master's thesis
February 2019

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO
HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Faculty	Department
Faculty of Social Sciences	

Author
Otto Kaplas

Title
Threat, risk or business as usual? Securitization of Russian energy in Finland, Germany and Poland after the Ukraine crisis

Subject
Democracy and Global Transformations – Political science

Level	Month and year	Number of pages
Master's thesis	February 2019	72

Abstract

This paper examines the energy policy development of three European Union member states of Finland, Germany and Poland before and after the Ukraine crisis of November 21st, 2013. The theory of securitization/desecuritization/riskification is used to examine if the crisis caused any changes in the perception of Russian energy, and if this had an effect on the domestic energy policy choices of the three member states. This paper will also look if the Energy Union can be considered a Regional Security Complex, built around the perceived threat or risk of Russian energy, and if this will lead to greater integration or disintegration of the EU. This paper is structured as a comparative case study where all the three member states energy policy developments before and after the crisis are compared to each other and analyzed.

This paper finds that all of the three member states had very similar reactions to the Ukraine crisis, but only Finland and Poland saw any true changes in their energy policy choice making. Finland riskified Russian energy (especially gas and oil) but maintained their bilateral energy relations with Russia through partly state-owned companies, with the most prominent project being the Fennovoima nuclear power plant project. Finland has begun to move towards reducing Russian fossil fuels from their energy base, and is transitioning towards domestic wood-based biofuels, nuclear energy, renewables and energy connections with the Baltic states. Germany successfully desecuritized Russian energy after the crisis and continued their bilateral energy projects with Russia. The most prominent German-Russian energy project was the Nord Stream 2 project which like the Fennovoima project, is operated under state owned companies and has soured Germanys relations with Eastern EU member states. Polish reaction to the Ukraine crisis were the complete securitization of linked energy. The Polish government had overseen energy policy decisions in the past, but the crisis pushed them to take direct governmental control of energy policy and they intend to end the use of Russian energy altogether in the future. Poland also turned strongly against German energy policy line in the EU and has emerged as a staunch opposition to EU climate regulations, Nord Stream 2 project and bilateral energy trade with Russia.

The Energy Union was shown not be a sign of a Regional Security Complex forming around Russian energy in the EU and will more likely lead to further disintegration of the EU energy policy as the conflicting energy security needs, and interpretations, will divide the EU on the issue of Russian energy.

Keywords
Securitization, Riskification, Energy Union, Regional Security Complex, Energy, European Union, Germany, Finland, Poland

Where deposited

Additional information

Table of contents

1 Introduction

Energy security has become one of the most discussed topics within the European Union (EU) in past few decades and has risen to challenge both economic and environmental views of energy policy. Many theorists have studied the rise of security politics within the EU, and in 2011 the former President of the European Commission José Manuel Durão Barroso talked how the European energy policy had a need for "Safe, secure, sustainable and affordable energy supply"[1]. In the past EU energy policy has stayed on the level of economic policy and not security policy[2], and the member states all have had their own ways of handling their energy security. There is a strong internal division on how energy is perceived and member states perception of energy security can be affected by import dependency, energy intensity and the market strength of national energy companies[3].

The EU has always been a net-importer of energy, with 53.6% of the energy used in 2016 coming from third countries[4]. The single largest importer of energy to the EU is the Russian federation, with 31.9% of the EU's crude oil and 40% of natural gas coming from Russia in 2016[5]. This energy dependency has often been dubbed the "Russia challenge"[6] as Russian energy supplies are both vital to the EU's economic growth, but Russia is not always seen as a reliable or trustworthy trading partner.

During the first years leading up to what would become the Ukraine crisis the EU was preoccupied with the aftermath of the euro crisis and climate change mitigation which dominated the energy policy choice making of most of the member states. Russian gas disruptions of 2006 in Georgia and 2009 in Ukraine caused major fears in many EU member states that they too might have to face the possibility of energy disruptions, as most of EU member states are highly dependent on Russian oil or gas. The way that Russia uses their energy as an enforcement tool was dubbed "geoeconomics" which aimed to drive a wedge between EU member states by offering cheap and abundant

[1] Barroso 2011
[2] Youngs 2009; Shaffer 2009, 3, 92, 134
[3] Pointvogl 2009
[4] Eurostat. Statistics explained
[5] Eurostat. EU imports
[6] Andersen 2017, 16

fossil fuels in exchange for political and economic favors[7]. The dependency on Russian energy became to be seen in many member states as a direct threat to their sovereignty and the EU saw a resurgence of energy security initiatives, mainly in the Eastern member states.

The Ukraine crisis that began on November 21st of 2013 was the moment that changed the security situation in Europe, as for the first time since the breaking up of Yugoslavia there was an open conflict in Europe. The Russian challenge turned from being a looming problem into a serious security policy question for most EU member states, and there was a consensus within the EU that actions must be taken to counter Russia's actions in Ukraine, but the question remained what should be done about Russian energy domination.

In this study I will examine the energy policy development of three EU member states of Finland, Germany and Poland to see how the Ukraine crisis affected their energy policy development, and if the crisis led to greater energy policy integration in the EU. The Ukraine crisis works as a pivotal crisis moment that shows the different ways how member states handle energy security issues and formulate their energy policy accordingly. The differences and similarities in national energy policy choice making processes are the key in understanding how a common EU energy policy can be created. The examination of energy policy choice making after the Ukraine crisis will also help to shed light on what are the vital energy systems of each state, and how far each state is willing to go to maintain energy security.

This study will be done as a comparative case study, where I will track the energy policy development of each of the three-member states before and after the Ukraine crisis. The development of the energy policy decisions will then be analyzed to see if there are signs of securitization, riskification or desecuritization of energy policy. I will also use the Regional Security Complex Theory to see if the EU's Energy Union project has been created from a unified fear of Russian energy, and if the project has the potential to develop into an EU wide regional security complex (RSC).

[7] Wigell & Vihma 2016

1.1 Research background

The European Union was built on the same idea as its predecessor the European Coal and Steel Union that trade and free movement of goods is the way to not only create peace, but also to expand the Unions influence. Energy has been a public and private commodity in the EU which makes it both low and high politics. For most of the EU's existence energy has been a part of low politics, and has been categorized as an economic commodity which is regulated by the markets and not by the EU itself. This might all, however, change as the Energy Union is said to move the EU's energy policy towards high political control and hard power, where the EU could use their 400-billion-dollar single market as a geoeconomical tool to force their will when necessary. The Energy Union project has been called by its critics a protectionist enterprise, or even as a liberal mercantilist project[8] which could move the EU away from a soft power market controlling regulatory state[9], and towards a more direct hard power user.

The Energy Union aims to increase the EU's energy security and at the same time increase energy efficiency and decarbonification. There is, however, a continuous debate of what the Energy Union is and what it will become. Marco Siddi sees that the Energy Union has no clear strategy or objective how to achieve these goals, as the different EU member states all have their own energy policy paths[10]. In order to formulate a strategy for the Energy Union the EU member states need to find common concerns and goals which take into consideration the energy security concerns, vital energy systems, technical factors and socio-economic environments of the member states. Only then can the Energy Union truly begin to have a difference in re-enforcing EU's energy security via energy policy harmonization and integration.

1.1.1 Energy Security

Energy security has been an important subject in the EU ever since 2006 and 2009 gas disputes, but it truly became part of the EU's agenda after the Ukraine crisis. The Russian aggression, and the problems with gas negotiations raised concerns what would happen if the energy flows from Russia stopped coming. Energy security had been a major part of politics in many Eastern member states for years, so by opening energy

[8] Andersen 2017, V
[9] Majone 1994; McGowan & Wallace 1996
[10] Siddi 2016a, 131

security as an agenda the EU was able to reassure many concerned states that they were taking the threat seriously.[11]

The EU has tried to harmonize energy security via energy policy initiatives, with the Third Energy Package adopted in 2009[12] and the first steps towards the Energy Union being laid out in February 2015. The most radical step taken by the EU was in 2014, when they launched the European Energy Security Strategy[13] which simulated the possibility of a total gas import halt. The tests showed that if such a scenario would occur the results would be devastating. The goal was then set towards a more unified EU energy policy that would guarantee energy security of the entire EU which would in turn lead to the Energy Union project. But the question remained what could be done to increase energy security, and what energy security means for the EU?

The most common answer to the question of what energy security in the EU is: "reliability of natural gas supply"[14]. This explanation does not, however, answer to the deeper and more convoluted questions of the nature of energy security, so alternative explanations of its true nature have emerged.

The classical energy security definition was created by Daniel Yergin who sees energy security as "availability of sufficient energy supply at affordable prices." which has 4 dimensions: availability, accessibility, affordability and acceptability. [15] This explanation takes into account the more socio-economic dimensions of energy security and looks beyond the traditional military security dimension. The price and availability of energy are important aspects for any nation, but there are also the questions of energy supply and environmental issues that impact energy security. This definition is mostly used by energy consuming nations and not by energy exporters[16]. This definition is also used by the International Energy Agency (IEA)[17].

There are many other definitions that try to expand the idea of energy security to encompass all the necessary parts. One definition by Benjamin Sovacool states that

[11] Fischer 2015, 2
[12] European parliament 2009
[13] European Commission 2014a
[14] Szulecki 2018, 5.
[15] Szulecki, 2017, 3; Yergin 1988, 69–82.
[16] Yergin 2006, 70.
[17] International energy agency 2014b

energy security can be defined as "how to equitably provide available, affordable, reliable, efficient, environmentally benign, properly governed and socially acceptable energy services."[18]. This view allows the expansion of the energy security into other areas of study and allows to view all the competing issues that arise within energy security.

Some definitions of energy security try to create a workable framework so that the level of energy security can be measured. The idea is to use indicators to depict issues and possible approaches which make up energy security.[19] These framework models, however, only function in single situations and are not useful when taken out of their original settings.

Kacper Szulecki sees that a common EU energy policy can only be achieved if the perceptions of energy security are common. He supports the definition created by Aleh Cherp and Jessica Jewell of energy security as the *"*Low vulnerability of vital energy systems*"*[20]. This definition is very helpful in understanding the technical and socio-economic dimensions of energy security, and it helps to simplify the meaning by bypassing policy-oriented definitions of the term. Lastly Szulecki states that the definition allows the critical observation of energy security.[21]

Reliability and affordability are some of the main dimensions of energy security across nations. In practice energy security is usually seen as the same as security of supply (especially oil and gas)[22]. Many politicians and state officials bring out energy security in issues that have to do with energy stockpiles, and the utilization of domestic energy sources. Some also see energy security as being entwined with economic security, as the price and availability of energy causes both energy security and economic security issues[23].

Energy security can be thus divided into multiple segments that might affect it, such as: environmental concerns, infrastructure, supply, available energy sources, economic

[18] Sovacool 2011, 5846
[19] Sovacool & Mukherjee 2011; Szulecki 2017,3
[20] Cherp & Jewell 2014
[21] Szulecki 2018, 333-334
[22] Faas & Gheorghe (ed) 2011, 11
[23] Bohi & Toman 1996, 1

concerns and energy dependency. Every part has its benefits and downsides, and this shows the difficulty of creating energy security. One can never have everything, and states create their own energy security definitions according to their own conditions. These conditions can also change, and new risks and threats might arise which have not been taken into consideration before. Therefore, the definition of *"*Low vulnerability of vital energy systems*"* of Aleh Cherp and Jessica Jewell is very useful. This simplified definition allows the studying of energy security from the view of energy systems and allows to see the development of the Energy Union by studying energy security concerns that arise from very different nations. The sudden shock of the Ukraine crisis helps to pinpoints the locations of the vital energy systems as the member states rush to secure their own energy security concerns as quickly as possible.

1.1.2 The Energy Union

The Energy union project was first introduced in 2014[24], and finally launched in February 2015[25] by the European commission. The project was first brought up in the EU by the then Polish prime minister and the current president of the European council Donald Tusk, and was imagined as a way to harmonize and unify the energy policies of the EU member states. In the original idea the Energy Union was to be headed by the Vice-President of the Commission, who would function as a representative of the EU and negotiate the energy relations with third parties. Currently this view has not truly emerged, and the role of the vice-president is more of a voice of the Energy Union than its leader.[26]

The "Russia challenge" is often seen as the original motivator for the Energy Union project. The Georgian and Ukrainian gas outages of 2006, 2009 and again in Ukraine in 2013 were a wakeup call for the EU that their soft power approach was not working with Russia and in fact Russia was using its energy as a strategic tool[27]. The projects intention is to help the EU in four policy areas: diversify European energy sources and ensure energy security, unified and integrated energy market, create a more energy efficient system, lower the EU's climate impact by reducing greenhouse gases and

[24] Reuters 2014: "Donald Tusk on the Polish project of the European Energy Union."
[25] European commission 2015b
[26] Fischer 2015, 2
[27] Shaffer 2009, 44; Andersen 2017, 2

finally to prioritize research and innovations of low-carbon and clean energy technologies.[28]

The European commission saw that a common EU energy policy had to be based on the security of supply and economic affordability[29]. This security of supply and affordable price-oriented plan was later supplemented with new objectives of sustainability and climate change mitigation policy[30]. The main incentive for the Energy Union from the beginning has always been import dependency which the commission called as a fundamental structural weakness of the EU[31]. It is this weakness that was the beginning of the Energy Union, and the project has successfully brought many feuding member states together to formulate an EU energy and climate policy, but the question remains what the Energy Union truly is, and what it will become.

There is a difficulty on the part of the member states to agree on the role and power of the Energy Union. Others want to see it as a more advisory body, that works together with member states in creating energy policy and does not harm the energy security of other member states. Others wish to see a more assertive and stronger Energy Union that enforces member states to stick with the EU energy and climate policy. The problems also stem from the different ideas of what aspects of energy security the EU wants to enforce. Climate change mitigation policy is often at odds with national energy security concerns of many states, and the EU has been criticized by many of being too focused on the mitigation of carbon emissions, rather than focusing on the more pressing concerns of import dependency and security of supply.[32]

Currently the Energy union is only a strategic vision, meant to create an integrated EU energy market by pushing the member states to help each other in order to strengthen their energy security, create environmentally sustainable economies and bolster their energy efficiency. There is, however, a continuous debate between member states if decarbonification and energy security can both be achieved without harming the other. Eastern European states for example see energy security as a far more pressing matter

[28] Matúš 2016
[29] European Commission 1968, 7; European Commission 2015a, 1.
[30] Maltby 2013
[31] European Commission 2000, 2, 46.
[32] Fischer 2015, 2–3

than climate friendly energy which they argue is not affordable.[33] This study will try to see if the Russian energy domination has become a shared energy security concern among the member states after the Ukraine crisis, and if the Energy Union can help in securing the member states energy security.

1.1.3 Formulation of research problem and tasks

I will be studying energy policy development of the EU by focusing on three-member states, as there have been very little study of common EU energy policy and energy security development from the perspective of member states. The states that I will be looking at are Finland, Poland and Germany. I have chosen these member states as they all represent distinct aspects of EU member states, and they allow me to see how security and economic policies of very different states ended up forming the Energy Union, and how the member states perceive energy security and formulated their own energy policy before and after the Ukraine crisis.

Finland is a Nordic nation which borders the Russian Federation, but it is not a NATO member state. Finland has very few domestic energy sources with a mainly nuclear and oil-based energy pallet with large possibilities to enlarge their production on wood-based bioenergy and nuclear power.

Poland is a former Eastern bloc state with extensive energy grids and gas pipelines linking them to Russia. Their energy base is very heavily dependent on Russian imported natural gas and domestic coal. They are also a member of NATO and the Visegrad group[34]. They also border the Russian enclave of Kaliningrad.

Germany is the largest user of energy in Europe and most of Russian gas and oil imported into the EU go to fuel the German industry. Germany is a NATO member state and arguably the most influential EU member state. Germany is trying to move towards total abandonment of coal and nuclear power and are trying to achieve total carbon neutrality with renewable energy.

[33] Siddi 2016a, 131-132.
[34] A cultural-political alliance of Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia.

Energy policy in the EU has clearly taken a step towards security policy, but the question remains how much, and how the member states differences in understanding and crating energy policies affect the development of the Energy Union? The Energy Union project was brought up before the Ukraine crisis, yet it has always been halted by the member states voting against it, as many member states feel uneasy about the EU meddling in their national energy policies, and some also wish to pursue bilateral energy deals with Russia.[35]

The research questions that I will be studying are:

1) How did the Ukraine crisis affect the national energy policy choices and the perception of Russian energy of Finland, Germany and Poland?
2) Did the Ukraine crisis lead to a common EU RSC formation around the threat of Russian energy dependency, and is the Energy Union built to combat this threat?

1.2 Logic of analysis

This study will first describe the theory of securitization, desecuritization, riskification and the regional security complex. The energy policy development of the three member states will then be described from before the Ukraine crisis in November 2013 to after the crisis, ending at around the years 2017–2018. The energy policy developments will then be analyzed and compared to each other to see how the energy policy processes were affected by the crisis and has there been signs of a unified regional security complex forming within the EU around the perceived threat of Russian energy domination. I will be focusing my research on certain key national and EU energy projects, namely the Energy Union, Nord stream 2 and the Fennovoima Hanhikivi nuclear power plant projects.

1.2.1 Data selection

My data will comprise of primary data in the form of official publications by the IEA, Finland, Germany, Poland and the EU, such as reports, official documents and statistics. From the member states I will use official documentations and statistics from

[35] Andersen 2017, 3.

governments, ministries and other government agencies. Secondary data will comprise of varied sources concerning energy and security policy, and include for example news articles, academic papers or statistics made by state and private researchers or institutions, corporations and other relevant sources.

2 Theoretical framework

It is important that the securitization/desecuritization/riskification of energy policy in EU member states can be studied and compared. The way that energy is perceived, and how it is created and carried out in member states can have major consequences on other states decision makers and the energy security of the entire EU. Cherp and Jewell see that the combination of securitization with the study of vital energy systems opens promising avenues for future research of energy security[36].

2.1 Securitization, desecuritization & riskification

2.1.1 Securitization

The work of Buzan and Wæver at the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI) put forward the concept of 'securitization'[37], focusing on how the invocation of the concept of security affects issues. For the Copenhagen School the forming of security issues had to be broadened to include other realms into the study of security other than states and military relations. Single actors within institutions can affect what becomes a security threat and a direct military threat is not the only way that a subject can be securitized. The sectors in international relations also do not act in isolation and affect one another[38]. The main idea of securitization studies is that security threats are socially constructed and studying of these processes makes it possible to view how security issues are formed and how they are diffused. It also gives the possibility to examine the impact that security issues have on policy making.

Securitization is the process where a subject becomes an intentional matter of security, in the case of this study this would mean energy itself, especially energy linked to the Russian federation. This would show as the need for rapid actions taken to reduce energy dependency that do not follow general political processes, but instead take the

[36] Cherp & Jewell 2014, 419
[37] Buzan et al 1998
[38] Buzan et al 1998, 8

form of crisis politics. There are two types of threats to energy security: a shock (momentary) and stress (long term). A shock calls for resilience for the nation, whereas stress calls for robustness[39]. Energy might be removed from the political and public sphere into the security sphere for strategic reasons, to protect national sovereignty on energy policy[40]. The goal is to turn the subject into an issue that no longer needs to abide to normal political proceedings and can be made into a subject that needs quick and swift action.

According to the classical Copenhagen school definition of securitization a successful securitization takes three steps: 1) The identification of the existential threat, 2) Action taken to prevent the threat, 3) Breaking free of rules[41]. The goal of securitization is to get the power to tackle the threat with any means necessary.

Securitization happens when a subject is deemed a matter of security by the securitizing actor which in turn is accepted by the wider socio-political sphere. This is done according to Buzan through a speech act where an actor labels an issue to be a matter of security[42]. The key to the speech act is the level on which it is performed within society and does the target audience accept it or reject it. The issue cannot become securitized if there is no support for the securitization[43]. A speech act is usually formulated as an existential threat, and securitization has happened if the speech act spreads to wider discourse and is reproduced. The securitizing actor must understand their audience, as existential threats differ between societies and socio-cultural groups[44].

According to Mark Salter there are four possible types of audiences to securitization: popular, elite, technocratic, and scientific. The process of securitization is a lengthy political process between the securitizer and the audience. The level of securitization is important, as securitization can be accepted by one or more of the targeted audiences. The process of securitization could fail if the elite for example does not see the event as securitized, but the popular audiences do. Salter gives the example of climate change,

[39] Cherp & Jewell 2014
[40] Genschel & Jachtenfuchs. 2016.
[41] Buzan et al 1998, 6
[42] Buzan et al 1998, 26
[43] Buzan et al 1998, 25
[44] Salter 2008

which has been securitized by scientific and technocratic audience in the United States, but it has not been securitized by the elite or the popular audiences.[45]

Szulecki, however, sees that the speech act is not something that is necessarily needed when energy is being securitized, as according to him securitization is a mechanism, not a single event[46]. To find securitization in energy policy one needs to look at gradual movements of energy policy towards security policy during many years. Securitization is not an event, but and interpretation of an event[47]. From this view the securitizing actor points to a certain issue and turns it into an existential threat which needs a policy change in order to be confronted. This action changes the institutional and ideational contexts, and the political subject, and begins a slow process towards possible securitization[48].

There are those that argue that energy is not something that has or can be securitized. Jonna Nyman sees energy security as something that is often part of the political domain, and not securitizisable. Energy security can be discussed in normal politics and does not need exceptional measures[49]. Szulecki, however, does see energy as something that might be even more securitizisable than other policy areas. He argues that energy has a history of being ruled via "technocratic governance" and not by public scrutiny. Energy, according to Szulecki, is a policy area governed by a mix of governments, companies and other actors that rule over energy policy by making it an exception from traditional policymaking. This "exceptionalizing" of energy, might be understood as the same as "emergency measures" that makes up securitization.[50]

Securitization is something that is debated if it is necessary and some even see securitization as a failure of traditional ways of politics[51]. Common security concerns do not always lead to further integration, rather it might cause the opposite; the strengthening of national sovereignty on energy policy and security. According to

[45] Salter 2008
[46] Szulecki 2016, 15
[47] Guzzini 2012
[48] Hay 2011
[49] Nyman, 2013; Szulecki, 2017, 2
[50] Szulecki 2017, 7.
[51] Buzan et al 1998, 9

Andrew Judge and Tomas Maltby the Energy Union project for example might not be strengthened because of securitization, but it might even be weakened by it.[52]

2.1.2 Desecuritization

Securitization can be overcome through desecuritization where actions are taken that try to lessen the imagined threat of the subject of securitization and move the subject back into the realm of normal politics. A successful desecuritization keeps the subject within the rules of the system, and the actors stop treating each other as security problems and begin to see each other as friends. There still are challenges and competition but any problems are dealt with normal politics.[53]

If a subject moves completely into this level of desecuritization it will eventually leave the realm of security all together[54]. This level of desecuritization is, however, un-realistic, and even as the EU is a desecuritizating actor in most cases, even it is not immune to securitizing moves within its own political system. Desecuritization can lead to either normal politics or a securitizised event moving into riskification or it might fail to lessen the perceived threat.[55] Desecuritization is often seen as the more positive and desirable goal than securitization, but it can also hinder the response to a genuine threat[56].

2.1.3 Riskification

Although securitization has been used in a wide variety of energy policy studies, a common feature has emerged where many doubt the usefulness of the Copenhagen school version of securitization when studying energy.

Multiple studies have shown that the Copenhagen schools' idea of securitization is either extremely rare, or that the theory of securitization is far too exclusive to include events that divert from the Kopenhagen school version of securitzation.[57] The key problem is that it is focused on a single logic of security; based on existential threat.

[52] Judge & Maltby 2017, 179
[53] Buzan & Wæver 2003, 56
[54] Buzan & Wæver 2003, 56
[55] Corry 2012, 249
[56] Wæver 1999.
[57] Nyman 2014; Natorski & Herranz-Surrallés 2008; McGowan 2011.

Security is often pluralistic in nature and not based on a single issue.[58] The second problem is that securitization does not take into consideration the possible contextual factors; such as established power structures or institutional structures. Securitization that does happen in one nation might not happen in another even under the same circumstances because the state has different ways of creating their policy or that the internal conditions vary significantly.[59] Olaf Corry critizises securitization theory for not specifying how the audience, sociological conditions and choice of policy tools affect the outcome of the securitizing move.[60]

There are technical and political-economic factors that affect energy issues: Technical factors such as transit networks, sources of the energy and the role of particular energy types are highly path dependent and need a lot of time and money to change. Technical factors constrain possible future actions and shapes them. Political-economic factors are special conditions within nations, such as how energy is traded and bought under specific rules and regulations. These conditions make up the energy market system of the nation. This creates a structure that guides the interactions of the actors. There are state-led (the state regulates the market participants according to their political will), market-led systems (market participants are the primary actors) and mixed systems.[61]

To better understand and take these factors into consideration Olaf Corry distinguishes between securitization and what he called "riskification"[62]. Riskification means that "exceptional measures are made permanent and introduced to deal with merely potential, hypothetical and less-than-existential dangers"[63]. Whereas securitization happens to combat imminent and existential threats, riskification is aimed at combating long term 'risks'. These future scenarios need to be diffused and prevented by riskifying a certain policy area.[64] When a certain subject becomes riskified it is constantly reflected to other policy areas and affects all future policy decisions.[65] There are some theorists that see riskification as a possible pathway to securitization, where piece by

[58] Judge & Maltby 2017, 182
[59] Judge & Maltby 2017, 183
[60] Anthony 2006; Balzacq 2011; Balzacq 2005; Stritzel 2007; Salter 2008; Corry 2011, 240
[61] Judge & Maltby 2017, 184
[62] Corry 2012
[63] Corry 2012
[64] Corry 2012, 237
[65] Beck, 1999.

piece the society is securitized so that possible risks can be controlled.[66] Every nation has their own areas of political-economic and technical areas that are the weak part of their security which constitutes a possible risk. These areas might take time and resources away from other areas and block any other possible areas from being securitized or riskified. For example, the updating of the nation's entire energy grid might take priority over greenhouse gas reduction.

A key difference between risks and threats is that a risk does not need to be an existential threat that needs to be real and imminent. A subject becomes riskified when a riskifying actor is able to convince the audience that the parts and conditions that can cause a future crisis exist, and that to stop it from ever materializing it needs constant supervision and priority status over all other policy areas.[67] Securitization includes a plan of action to defend against the threat, and riskification includes a plan to govern the parts and conditions that make up the risk.[68] When a subject starts to move towards riskification it is first constructed as a risk towards a certain governable object, in this study's case energy security or the security of supplies. The state will then try to boost up the resilience of the governable object. Lastly riskification will include the legitimization of the precautionary methods, for example a safety margin which makes riskification far less drastic than securitization.[69]

Olaf Corry sees securitization/riskification logic as a good way to study energy security, as energy policy issues are more often risks than threats. Riskification does not replace securitization, as they both have their advantages and disadvantages. Riskification can also lead to securitization. All in all, securitization, riskification and desecuritization create a triad where an issue can move between the three if the necessary actions and conditions apply.[70]

2.2 Regional security complex

The second theory I'm using is Barry Buzans and Ole Wævers Regional Security Complex Theory (RSCT). The theory has shown how the EU formed it's desecuritizing

[66] Corry 2012, 237
[67] Corry 2012, 246
[68] Corry 2012, 247
[69] Corry 2012, 249
[70] Corry 2012, 235

ways during the Cold War, by having to balance between two superpowers, and rather than trying to directly side with one, the EU decided to avert another conflict in Europe by staying as neutral as possible. The end of the Cold War had a massive impact overall international security sphere, and rather than weakening RSC's the end of the cold-war accelerated the process[71]. The lack of superpowers made regions more susceptible to interregional rivalries and allowed local powers to make their security threats into RSC's[72]. EU was, according to Buzan and Wæver, "Set free" to create their own security agenda which quickly lead to the formation of multiple different security issues[73].

The RSCT sees that security spreads more easily within regions than internationally, and different actors within the region all have their own national or local security threats. These security complexes are subsystems of states within the international system whose major security concerns are inextricably linked. This can lead to a slow but sure level of securitization within the area, when the securitization of an issue in one regional actor leads to the same issue to be securitized within the entire region. RSCT is both a materialist and constructivist approach, with ideas of bounded territorial and neorealist distribution of power and with constructivist ideas of politically constructed securitization[74].

The definition of an RSC is a "set of units whose major processes of securitization, desecuritization, or both are so interlinked that their security problems cannot reasonably be analysed or resolved apart from one another"[75]. The definition was conceived to shed the state centric view of the RSCT and allow a more global and institutional use to be possible. Classical security analysis is dominated by national and global levels, but Buzan argues that there is no nation which security is self-contained, and the fears and aspirations of neighboring states affect the security of an entire region[76]. These threats, however, can be passed on, and once a certain security threat has grown enough that threat becomes a shared one within the region. This would explain the long and slow development of a unified EU energy policy, and the sudden

[71] Katzenstein 2000
[72] Buzan & Wæver 2003, 3
[73] Buzan & Wæver 2003, 352
[74] Buzan & Wæver 2003, 4
[75] Buzan & Wæver 1998: 201
[76] Buzan & Wæver 2003, 43

rapid development of the Energy Union project; the issue had been a small-scale security threat in some member states before rapidly expanding to become an EU wide securitized issue.

The EU can be classified as a centered RSC which has been unified by an institution rather than a state (e.g Russia). The EU is hard to compare to other regions, and it can be viewed either as a unified RSC or as an RSC in security community form. A security community is a Deutscian definition where states that are actors cannot imagine a war among each other[77]. This idea has been the core idea behind EU's development and has been achieved by economic integration and due political processes. The EU has securitized their expansion and integration, as the EU sees that the only way to secure peace in the region is the constant expansion and development of the EU, but many member states see that this development could also be seen as a security threat to their economic and political sovereignty. As a security community the EU's main method of tackling issues is desecuritization where as the main dynamic of a RSC is securitization[78]. EU has shown signs of this desecuritization in their actions, as in the past political, economic, environmental and societal problems have not been securitized but have been dealt with classical political action, not as security issues. As a regulatory state the EU is naturally slow to change, so an RSC would also explain the reason how such a sudden change in policy could be possible, especially when considering the differences that the different EU member states, institutions and organizations have. Buzan and Wæver also point out that the EU still hasn't created a unified RSC, but if the Energy Union project has been caused by some level of RSC formation then the EU has moved towards greater integration in security policy.

The RSCT, according to Buzan and Wæver is useful in studying international relations for three reasons: "First it tells us something about the appropriate level of analysis in security studies, second it can organize empirical studies, and third, theory-based scenarios can be established on the basis of the known possible forms of, and alternatives to, RSCs."[79]. Insecurity and proximity are interlinked so the study of two regions (EU and Russia) allows to examine how their actions affect the regions. The

[77] Deutsch 1957, 5-9
[78] Buzan & Wæver 2003, 56
[79] Busan & Wæver 2003, 45

member states should then show signs of increasing insecurity with their proximity to Russia.

The key in studying this relationship is to start within the regions themselves, and study the member states by examining four variables: 1) Boundary (where does one region end, and another begin), 2) Anarchic structure (The RSCT must be comprised of two or more autonomous units), 3) Polarity (The distribution of power among the units, 4) Social construction (the patterns of amity and enmity among the units). From these variables you can make three predictions on how the RSCT develops: 1) Maintenance of status quo which means that the structure does not change, 2) Internal transformation which means that the changes that occur happen within the region and can be processes of integration, disintegration or changes in amity or enmity, 3) External transformation which means that the changes happen beyond the boundary of the region either by the boundary being moved either by the RSCT being split or being merged with another region[80].

3 Methodological framework

Methodologically this study is a comparative case study, with the Ukraine crisis as the main case. I will use the securitization/desecuritization/riskification of energy policy in EU member states to the case of the Ukraine crisis, and compare the energy policy development of the member states to see if a common EU energy policy moved towards greater integration or division. I will also see if there are signs that RSC's have formed within the EU after the crisis.

In the next three chapters I will look chronologically at the energy policy development of Finland, Germany and Poland. These chapters will help to show the development of the energy policy in these states. The data used in these chapters vary according to the national differences and special characteristics of the member states energy policy decision making.

[80] Buzan & Wæver 2003, 53

4 Finland

4.1 Overview

In 2015 Finland had a population of 5.48 million, and the capital city of Helsinki had a population of little over 626 000. Other major metropolitan areas include Espoo, Vantaa and Tampere. Finland has a 1 340 km border with the Russian federation, a 614 km border with Sweden and a 727 km border with Norway.[81]

Finland has one of the lowest population densities (18 people per square kilometer) of all EU member states[82]. The country is, however, highly industrialized and has very large and developed high-tech manufacturing, electronics, chemical, forestry and paper industries. The energy policy of Finland is also influenced by the lack of natural resources, long winters and geographical limitations that make it very difficult for the country to connect to European energy markets[83]. Finland is, however, a part of the Nordic electricity market, together with Sweden, Germany, Latvia, Norway, Lithuania, Estonia, The United Kingdom and Denmark, called Nord pool[84].

Energy security is one of the most important aspects the Finnish governments concerns, as the country is extremely dependent on imported fossil fuels and energy transit infrastructures to the rest of the EU remains weak. This poses a major challenge for security of supply, and the Finnish government has ruled that Finland must maintain an energy reserve in the case of a crisis situations, and the basis for the security of supply of energy is in diversification, decentralization and efficiency in energy production[85].

The Finnish energy policy sphere has been influenced by the EU energy policy ever since the country joined the European Union in 1995, and the countries energy policy legislation is strongly integrated with that of the EU[86]. One of the main energy policy areas that has been influenced by the EU is decarbonization of energy. Finland takes an active role in the fight against climate change and has ratified both the UN Kyoto

[81] International energy agency 2013a, 15; World Population Review
[82] Statistics Finland. 2014
[83] International energy agency 2013a, 10, 15
[84] Nordpool
[85] Ministry Economic affairs and Employment. “Reserve stocks and preparedness planning secure energy supply.”
[86] International energy agency 2013a, 9.

protocol and the Paris climate agreement in 2016[87]. Finland follows the EU 2030 climate and energy framework presented to the commission in 22 January 2014 and launched in October 2014[88]. Together with all other EU member states Finland has agreed to three targets for the year 2030: 40% cuts in greenhouse gas emissions from 1990 levels, 27% share for renewable energy and 27% increase in energy efficiency. The new 2030 climate and energy strategy builds on the 2020 climate and energy package which had the targets of 20% cuts in greenhouse gas emissions, 20% EU energy from renewables and 20% improvement in energy efficiency. The Finnish governments 2030 energy and climate strategy projections indicate that nuclear energy will have a major future role in the country's energy supply, increasing to 38.4% of TPES.[89]

The Finnish energy policy has always aimed at reduced energy imports, and the strengthening of self-sufficiency and energy efficiency. Diversification of energy supplies is particularly strong in Finland with renewable, nuclear and hydrocarbon energy each comprising roughly one third of the country's energy production. The expansion of nuclear power facilities is particularly important in Finland as it allows the diversification and self-production of energy without greenhouse emissions. Compared to other European countries Finland has a particularly large renewable energy production, but because of the cold winters (25% of energy goes to heating), dispersed population, industry and high living standards the energy consumption per-capita is the highest in the European Union.[90]

The Ministry of Economic affairs and Employment (MEE), is the main government body overseeing energy policy in Finland. MEE's Energy Department consists of five divisions: Energy Markets Division, Emissions Trading Division, Energy Efficiency and Technology Division, Nuclear Energy Division and Renewable Energy Division. MEE work with other ministries to form Finnish energy policy, including finance, the environment, transport and communications, agriculture and forestry and foreign affairs (international co-operation).[91] Finland outlines its energy policy in the MEE's

[87] International energy agency 2013a, 35
[88] European commission 2014b
[89] Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment 2017
[90] Statistics Finland. 2014
[91] International energy agency 2013a, 19

national energy and climate strategy, the latest versions published in 20.3.2013 and 24.11.2016.

The Finnish energy security is strongly influenced by the economic sphere. Finland's significant energy dependency on Russia (70% of energy imports) has been justified by the economic profitability of this trade to both parties, and security threats are often played down or accepted for economic reasons. Finland is, through many different links, tied to economic dependencies. Neste Oy and Fortum Oyj are both partly owned by the Finnish state and are linked with Russian gas and oil trade, and also to large energy projects such as the Nord Stream 2 project and the Fennovoima nuclear power plant project. This places Finland in a situation where continuing energy cooperation with Russia is economically viable but precarious for the energy security of the nation.[92] The Finnish partly state-owned energy company Fortum has a 14.1% market share in the energy market.[93]

4.2 Statistics

Finland produces approximately half of its energy supply, with total domestic production being 17.1 Million tons of oil equivalent (Mtoe)[94] in 2011. In 2011 renewable energy sources contributed 26.5% of TPES[95] followed by oil 26.4%, nuclear power 17.4%, coal 11.6%, natural gas 9.7% and peat based power plants produced 5.8% of supply.[96] In 2016 the TPES of renewable energy was 32%, oil was 26%, nuclear power contributed for 18% of TPES, with coal use dropping to 9% and natural gas use dropping to 6%. The biggest renewable energy sources in Finland are biofuels, wind and hydro power.[97]

Finland has very little natural reserves of fossil fuels, with no natural coal, gas or oil reserves. Finland does have uranium deposits but currently there is no domestic mining

[92] Tynkkynen & Pynnöniemi & Höysniemi 2017, 7
[93] International energy agency 2013a, 9
[94] A unit of energy defined as the amount of energy released by burning one tons of crude oil. Abbreviated as Mtoe from now on.
[95] Total primary energy supply is the total amount of energy of production and imports of energy, after subtracting exports and storage changes.
[96] International energy agency 2013a, 15
[97] IEA country statistics

or enriching. The country's energy is thus generated from imported fossil energy sources, renewables and nuclear power from imported uranium.[98]

Oil is the primary energy source used in Finland, with over a quarter of the country's total energy supply generated from oil-based energy sources[99]. Although divided into small groups, renewable energy is a rising energy source in Finland, and Finland plans to grow its share of renewable energy sources to 50% of all energy production by 2030, decrease energy dependency by diversifying its energy production base and reaching a level of self-sufficiency in energy to 55%. The 2030 climate strategy also calls for the phasing out of coal-based energy production and halving the use of oil. Finland is one of the only IEA countries with active plans to expand nuclear power facilities, and the country has a goal of reaching 60% share in nuclear power electricity production by 2030. The Finnish parliament plans to build two more nuclear power plants in the future, and if these projects are completed, the amount of nuclear energy in Finland could double by 2025[100]. Compared to other IEA countries natural gas makes up a very small percentage of Finland's energy base.[101]

In 2011 Finland imported around 77.8% of their TPES, of which 64.2% was oil, 17% coal and 12.4% natural gas. The Russian Federation was the main country of import, with 88.9% of oil, 100% of natural gas and 75.3% of coal coming from Russia.[102] All uranium used in Finnish nuclear power plants is imported, with the supplier ranging from western to Russian companies[103]. In 2016 45.33% of Finnish energy was imported, with 12.2 Mt of imports being oil of which 88.1% came from the Russian federation. Finland also imported 2,5 Bcm of Gas of which 100% came from Russia.[104]

4.3 Finnish energy policy before the Ukraine crisis

The Euro crisis of 2009 caused major shifts in Finnish energy policy, as Finland needed rapid structural changes to reach the necessary EU energy efficiency targets and reduce their share of greenhouse gas emissions. This resulted in the reduction of the use of

[98] International energy agency 2013a, 17-18
[99] International energy agency 2013a, 57
[100] International energy agency 2013a, 11
[101] Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment 2017, 9; IEA country statistics
[102] International energy agency 2013a, 18, 57, 67,81
[103] International energy agency 2013a, 93
[104] IEA country statistics.

fossil fuels, and the reduction of total emissions. In 2011 Finland was on track to reach all EU climate goals on all policy fronts. In terms of longer-term strategy Finland had decided to develop renewable energy and nuclear energy power solutions to combat both energy dependency and climate change.[105]

In 2011 Finland's energy policy was guided by the 2008 climate and energy strategy, the UN Kyoto protocol of 2005, and the European Commission's 2011 Energy Roadmap.[106]The EU's energy policy framework was interlinked with Finland's own energy targets, and the 2020 targets and the third package for the EU internal energy market of 2009, being particularly important.[107]

In 2012 Prime minister Jyrki Katainen emphasized the need for renewable energy and nuclear power, to strengthen domestic energy production and reduce Russian import dependency. Renewable energy alone, he argued, would not be enough to fill the energy gap after coal power would be phased out[108]. When the newly appointed Finnish President Sauli Niinistö made his first foreign visit to Germany in November 2012, one of the main talking points of the visit was bilateral energy relations. He saw that both Finland and Germany are trying to develop new renewable energy systems and should not do so alone.[109]

Emissions generated in Finland in 2011 were 6% below the targets in the Kyoto Protocol, and they were dropping every year between 2011 and 2013. The Katainen government even saw that the European Union's present emissions target for 2020 were not enough, and the emissions reduction targets should be raised to 30%. Although Finland was able to reduce energy consumption between the years 2008-2012, and easily reached the EU and UN goals on greenhouse emission reduction, the country was still not self-sufficient when it came to energy and was dependent on imported energy in winter. The plan was to make Finland completely self-sufficient in energy by 2020, by updating the climate and energy strategy of 2008, by the year 2013.[110]

[105] International energy agency 2013a, 10
[106] The Ministry of Economic affairs and Employment 2013a, 10
[107] International energy agency 2013a, 10
[108] Yle 2010, "Katainen: The need for nuclear power should be clearly stated."
[109] The President of the Republic of Finland 2012
[110] Ministry of Economic affairs and Employment 2013a, 64

One of the major energy projects going on at this time was the Fennovoima Hanhiki nuclear power plant project, started in 2007 and approved by the Finnish government in 2010. The project had at first been a joint project between the Finnish governments part-owned energy company Voimaosakeyhtiö SF and the German energy company E.ON. In 2012 E.ON decided withdraw from the project and sold all of their shares (34%). This all happened as the process of finding provider for the nuclear reactor was still under way. Both the French nuclear power company Areva and the Japanese Toshiba companies were interested in providing the Hanhikivi plant with a reactor, but as the Russian government owned Rosatom's sister company Rosatom Overseas decided to buy the shares sold by E.ON in 2013, Fennovoima decided to grant Rosatom the rights to provide the reactor.[111] This, however, was a problem as the original permit for the Hanhikivi nuclear power plant was given to Voimaosakeyhtiö SF and E.ON, and not Rosatom.[112] The project was thus put on hold as the process needed to be approved by the government and the parliament in 2014[113].

In 2012 energy policy was a major part of foreign and security policy in Finland. Energy security was strongly coupled with climate policy, and environmental factors had a strong influence on energy policy choice making.[114] The main framework of Finnish defense policy in 2013 was to have good bilateral relations with Russia, and work with the EU in broad international and regional cooperation. Globalization, non-state actors, population growth and climate change were mentioned as the most pressing issues in the security environment of Finland in 2013.[115] The relations with Russia were extremely important and being Finland's largest trading partner, it was crucial to maintain political dialogue and cooperation between authorities. Although seen as rivals by the Finnish Prime Minister's office, the EU and Russia were believed to be mutually interdependent of one another through trade.[116] Finland's energy security was threatened by local and global competition over vital energy resources, but the consensus was that the trading of energy with Russia was necessary and beneficial to all sides.[117]

[111] Länkinen 2013, 'Fennovoima chooses Rosatom'
[112] Fennovoima: The story of Fennovoima
[113] Taloussanomat 2014, "Fennovoima nuclear power plant back to parliament."
[114] Prime minister's office Finland 2013, 14
[115] Prime minister's office Finland 2013, 10.
[116] Prime minister's office Finland 2013, 34
[117] Prime minister's office Finland 2013, 17.

In early 2013 energy dependency was a major concern of the government. It was, however, seen that once the Olkiluoto 3 and the Fennovoima nuclear power plants came operational and the dispersal of energy production was achieved, the problem would be alleviated.[118] It was understood, however, that even with the new energy sources Finland would still be way below the European average in energy sufficiency. This, the government hoped, would be alleviated with the introduction of new renewable energy technologies, and economically this was a possibility for Finnish high technology industries. The development and use of biofuels were seen as a way for Finland to reduce fossil fuel use, reach the EU climate goals and gain a new form of domestic wood-based energy industry that would be complemented by nuclear energy.[119]

In March 2013 under the government of Jyrki Katainen the long-term objective was a carbon-neutral society by the year 2050.[120] In 2013 there were concerns in the Finnish government that the availability and price of energy might be at a risk, as the rising economies of China and India were entering the global energy markets with force, and the International Energy Agency anticipated that the price of oil will stay high, or even increase considerably. There were also risks related to the stability of the international market system. The goal for Finland in the EU context was to help in the development of shale gas infrastructure and liquefied natural gas (LNG) which was seen as the solution to rid Finland of all Russian natural gas dependency. Finland had also begun the planning of a gas pipeline called the baltciconnector which was planned to become operational in 2019. The project was mainly funded by the EU and would connect Finland to the Baltic gas market[121]. The coal markets and supply were stable, but the climate impact of fossil fuels and the subsequent EU restrictions and taxes on its use made them, in the Finnish government's eyes, a non-attractive energy source and all use of coal was planned to be phased out.[122]

4.4 Finnish energy policy after the Ukraine crisis

The Ukraine crisis and the Russian annexation of Crimea changed the security situation in Europe, and according to the Finnish government a military threat to Finland was

[118] The Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment 2013a, 13
[119] Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment 2013a
[120] Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment 2013b; The Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment 2013a, 1-2
[121] Baltic connector
[122] Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment 2013b

now possible, and Russia had become a threat to both Finland and to Europe. The Finnish government emphasized the role of the EU in the crisis as an essential and important security community that had to stand united against Russian aggression.[123] This view was echoed by the Finnish Ministry for Foreign affairs in their 2015 review on Finland's security cooperation, where a united EU response was seen as the answer to not only against Russia's aggression, but for comprehensive threats such as energy security, cyber security and terrorism[124]. Both the war in the Donbass and the annexation of Crimea were strongly condemned by the Finnish government, but even though Russia is stated as a military threat Finland still advocated for bilateral dialogue and economic cooperation to continue[125]. The government even saw Russia's isolation as a negative development and called for the EU and Russia to allow diplomatic solutions to the crisis[126]. Finland's energy cooperation with Russia was still extremely important, but now its continuation had to be interconnected with the development of the EU's Energy Union and the peace process in Ukraine.[127]

According to the research done by the Finnish Business and Policy Forum EVA in January 2015 the Finnish public's view on Russia had become more threatened[128]. Over 83% saw that Russia had become unstable, and 50% thinking that they were a military threat. However over 87% saw Russia still as an important trade partner. Many experts in Finland were, however, more worried about the Finnish economy than immediate security threats, as the fear was that Russian energy trade would stop if relations between the EU and Russia would continue to deteriorate.[129]

According to Jussi Laine the debate of the future Finnish-Russian relations grew in Finland, and the lack of consensus on Russia was new to Finnish security policy, as there had for decades been a common view of the relationship. Finland had always wanted to stay on the good side of Russia and maintain their position as a country with special relations with Russia. Because the Ukraine crisis had started when the Ukrainian government had dropped plans on forming closer trade ties with the EU, Finland saw the conflict as a conflict between the EU and Russia, but as an EU member state Finland

[123] Besier & Stoklasa 2017, 85; Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2015
[124] Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2015, 8
[125] Tynkkynen 2017, 11; Prime minister's office Finland 2016, 22
[126] Prime Minister's Office Finland 2016, 22
[127] Tynkkynen 2017, 27
[128] Apunen 2015, 76-77.
[129] Besier & Stoklasa 2017, 94; Apunen 2015, 76-77.

could not go their traditional route and formulate good relations with Russia on their own.[130] Although majority of the population and political elite endorsed the EU sanctions against Russia, there were signs that Finland was not as unified on the matter as many other EU member states. Although the insecurity and fear of Russia was rising, and single politicians and academics were concerned of a military threat to the country, the official Finnish position soon dropped the possibility of a direct Russian threat[131]. The Finnish President Sauli Niinistö met with the Foreign Minister of Russia Sergei Lavrov in June 2014. In the following press release he saw that the Finnish-Russian relations were not in trouble, but that there were external and momentarily difficulties between the EU and Russia[132].

Finnish actions were, however, different than their words. Finland boosted their defense budget, forged closer military partnerships with other Nordic states and strengthen ties with NATO. The Finnish army and border guards were on a 24/7 watch, and the Finnish air forces increased air force readiness. The Finnish army even sent letters to over 900 000 reservists updating them on their war time role.[133]

Even after the Ukraine crisis caused fear in Finland, it was still seen that nuclear power cooperation was an important part of promoting good relations with Russia[134]. It first seemed that the Fennovoima nuclear power plant project would not get the necessary 60% EU ownership majority it needed, as there were difficulties to get domestic or EU investment. In a surprise twist the Finnish state-majority owned energy company Fortum decided to invest in Fennovoima and fulfilled the needed 60% domestic ownership quota.[135] The 60% EU based ownership was finally confirmed, even after it was discovered that Russia was using a Croatian dummy company to reach the ownership criteria[136]. There were also some sudden political shifts within Finland with the former Minister of Economic Affairs Olli Rehn supporting the project, even though he had at first been against it. He had even said that the project could had been shut

[130] Besier & Stoklasa 2017, 92
[131]Alastalo 2016, "Foreign minister Soini: Russia is not a military threat."; Kajova 2015, "Defense minister Niinistö ''Russia is not a direct threat.""; Uusi Suomi 2017, 'Sauli Niinistö to Yle: "If we are taking about the threat of war, there is none to be seen in Finland."; Yle 2015, "Stubb: Russia is not a security policy threat."; Eduskunta 2016
[132]The President of the Republic of Finland 2014, "President Niinistö meets the Foreign Minister of Russia Sergei Lavrov."
[133] Besier & Stoklasa 2017, 92-93
[134] Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Finland 2016
[135] World Nuclear News 2014, "Fortum ready to take minority stake in Fennovoima nuclear project."
[136] Adomaitis & Ercanbrack 2015, "Finnish nuclear investor faces scrutiny over Russia link."

down in 2015 which could have had disastrous consequences for Finnish-Russian relations, as at the same time Finland had, as according to the EU sanctions, refused to grant visas for Russian diplomats to take part at the meeting of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. It was after Rehn's trip to Moscow that the Finnish state-owned energy company Fortum took part in the project.[137]

The role of nuclear power continued to be a highly contested issue in Finnish politics after the Ukraine crisis. Finland's plan to continue the Fennovoima Nuclear power plant deal with Russian state-owned corporation Rosatom caused major political upheaval in Finland, as the Green League party left the government when the nuclear power plant deal was approved by the parliament in December 2014. The main reasons were the feared influence of Russia on Finnish energy policy, but also the environmental and health fears associated with nuclear power. [138]

The possible energy security risks or even threats that might come from the Fennovoima project were raised in other spheres of Finnish state and society as well. According to Toivo Martikainen and Antto Vihma Russia's nuclear energy strategy is to offer cheap alternatives to other energy source's to strategically valuable countries, and the Fennovoima project is often seen as an attempt of Rosatom to get good reputation in the West, the main reason being the approval of the radiation and nuclear safety authority of Finland; Stuk[139]. Doctor Katri Pynnöniemi and Sinikukka Saari listed the Fennovoima nuclear power plant as a sample case of the strategic use of energy resources as a "carrot" to cause division within the EU member states and expand Russian energy domination in new areas and continue using energy as a way to achieve political goals[140]. The Finnish Security Intelligence Service warned in their 2015 report that foreign intelligence services are trying to influence the Finnish political environment, influence the Finnish public opinion on NATO and the EU sanctions and influence the energy policy decisions in the country[141].

Prime Minister Stubb talked to the parliament on the 7th of October 2014 about the direction that the government was taking Finnish energy policy. In his opening speech

[137] Loikkanen 2016, "Rehn: The collapse of Fennovoima nuclear power plant project was very close."
[138] Yle 2014, "Green Party votes unanimously to leave government."
[139] Martikainen & Vihma 2016, 6
[140] Pynnöniemi & Saari 2017
[141] Finnish Security Intelligence Service 2015, 23

he said that in the Finnish view energy policy is climate, economic and employment policy, but it also is security of supply, self-sufficiency and EU foreign & security policy. The biggest energy related threat which he brought up was climate change which would be countered with energy efficiency and nuclear power. These changes would also strengthen Finland's self-sufficiency and competitiveness. The second point was the economic dimension of energy policy in which Stubb said Finland has not kept up with other EU states. The third point in Stubb's speech was the global situation, namely Russia's actions in Ukraine which he said has raised foreign and security policy issues in Finnish energy policy. He saw that future risk analysis must take into consideration the possibility that energy could be used as a geoeconomic tool against Finland. The best course of action, according to the Prime Minister, would be the phasing out of coal, gas, oil and imported electricity, and replace them with domestic renewable energy and nuclear power. The Fennovoima plant, he argued, is a domestically owned energy project as it reached the necessary 60% EU ownership criteria. Stubb argued that the Fennovoima project will reduce Finnish dependency on Russian energy and strengthen domestic energy production. The Balticconnector pipeline would also give Finland an alternative source of natural gas, together with LNG terminals. The following comments made by political parties and MEP's showed that the issue of nuclear power, the future of bioenergy and economic sanctions on Russia were all highly contested issues. The conservative party was critical of Russian economic sanctions, especially when Finland was engaged in a nuclear energy project with Rosatom. The green league saw nuclear energy and Russia both with equal distrust, and the center party saw that domestic bioenergy must be developed further, and that energy imports from Russia must be brought down. All parties saw that coal, natural gas and oil use must be reduced considerably, to protect both the security of supply and to reach greenhouse gas reduction goals.[142]

In 2015 the MEE finished their report issued by the then Prime Minister Alexander Stubb in 26.4.2014. The report looked at the alternatives to Finnish energy policy and was drafted after the Ukraine crisis began. The main goal of this review was to look at renewable energy and the promotion of decentralized energy production. The focus was economic; strengthen Finnish competitiveness in the energy markets, but there were also mentions of other goals such as strengthen the nation's energy self-sufficiency and

[142] Eduskunta 2014

taking climate goals into consideration.[143] The report sought to shed light on new alternative sources of hydrocarbon energy (wood-based fuels, biofuel, wind, gas) and enhance Finland's energy transportation. The report sees that Finland must try to move away from coal power, and as old power stations are taken off the grid the question of the security of supply and the reserve energy production capabilities become clear. The Finnish gas policy is one of decentralization, alternative sources and free market competition; Russia could no longer be the sole provider and Finland would continue the plans to create a joint Finnish Estonian Baltic connector gas pipeline. If the Baltic connector pipeline will not materialize, then Finland will go on its own national natural gas policy route and will not be a part of the EU's internal energy market.[144] The report also paints the European energy union as a result of the Ukraine crisis, and as a necessary project to strengthen EU energy security. The Ministry saw that the execution of the set targets in the EU's 2030 climate and energy package were essential to the Energy Union, especially energy efficiency and alternative fuel sources.[145]

The environmental goals of the Finnish government were still in place after 2013, and the 16th of October 2014 Energy and Climate Roadmap had the goal of making Finland a carbon neutral nation by 2050. The main points in the roadmap were: 1) Energy self-sufficiency and the security of supply. This will be achieved via renewables and energy efficiency. This will also have a positive effect on the economy. 2) the amount of renewables to make up 50-60 % of TPES by 2050. 3) Forest biomass to be used as renewables. This will help the Finnish forest industry and it is useful for Finland to switch from fossil fuels to domestic biofuels. 4) Small dispersed energy option must be supported.[146] In 2015 the Parliament accepted the government's proposal for a new climate change bill that commits to 80% emissions reductions by 2050.[147] Climate change was singled out as the major global threat in 2016, and the Paris agreement was hailed by the Finnish Prime minister Juha Sipilä as a landmark achievement in the fight against global warming, and the process of moving from fossil fuels to renewables was seen by Sipilä as a tool to shift the economic and political power of the world[148].

[143] Ministry of economic affairs and employment 2015, 9-10
[144] Ministry of economic affairs and employment 2015, 4-7
[145] Ministry of economic affairs and employment 2015, 11
[146] Ministry of economic affairs and employment 2015, 14
[147] Ministry of economic affairs and employment 2015, 9-10
[148] Finnish government 2017, "Finland among the front-runners at international climate summit."

The Finnish Prime Minister Juha Sipilä outlined his government's objectives in the strategic document issued in 2015 in which he argues that good relations with Russia are in the best interest of the EU, but good relations cannot be restored before Russia respect international law and Ukraine's territorial integrity.[149] Sipilä also saw in his speech during the parliamentary discussion on foreign policy on the 20th of October 2015 that the relations between the EU and Russia are in a difficult situation, but the relations of Finland and Russia are strained but ultimately good. The Prime Minister also emphasized the importance of Russia as an economic partner.[150]

When Neste Oy dropped out of the Nord stream 2 project, Finland was left with the question if the project should be allowed to be built in its territorial waters, and if Finland should endorse or reject it in the EU. Even though some Finnish members of the European parliament from the conservative party aligned themselves against the project, the Finnish government and the majority of the EU member states supported it[151]. The official Finnish view of Nord Stream 2 project was given by the Finnish Prime Minister Juha Sipilä, who said that as the project does not provide any gas for Finland, and the Finnish government is not directly involved, Finland views the project only from an environmental perspective, and that the project had no security political implications[152]. The discussion on Nord Stream 2 arose again in Finland in 2018 when the Finnish government majority owned energy company Fortum purchased the German Uniper company that had invested over a billion euros in the Nord Stream 2 project[153]. This did not, however, change the opinion of the Finnish government that the project has nothing to do with the Finnish state, and that Fortum is in the project as a private corporation. After a lengthy process the Finnish Ministry of Economic affairs and Employment approved the construction of the pipeline in Finnish territorial waters in 5.4.2018[154]

[149] Prime minister's office Finland 2015a
[150] Prime minister's office Finland 2015b
[151] Kurki-Suonio 2018, "Conservative MEP's give a stern opinion "Nord Stream 2 should not be built."
[152] MTV 2017, "Sipilä: "Fortum's Uniper purchase does not have foreign- or security policy dimensions."
[153] Fortum 2018, "Fortum closes Public Takeover Offer on Uniper."
[154] Ministry of Economic affairs and Employment 2018, "Government approval for the Nord Stream 2 gas pipeline project."

5 Germany

5.1 Overview

Germany is a middle European country and is the fourth largest country in Europe. It is bordered by Denmark, Poland, the Czech Republic, Austria, Switzerland, France, Luxembourg, Belgium and the Netherlands. Germany's population has remained stable at around little over 80 million citizens since reunification. Berlin, the capital, is the largest city and had a population of around 3.5 million in 2016.[155] Germany is one of the most influential EU member states and boasts the largest economy of all EU member states. Politically Germany has a strong say in almost all EU decisions and is a strong supporter of greenhouse gas reductions and renewable energy. The Energy Union is seen by Germany as mainly a tool to achieve an even stronger and more integrated internal energy market.[156]

German energy policy has been dominated by the Energy Concept strategy, also known as Energiewende. It is a framework that aims to transform German energy sphere to a one based around renewable energy by 2050. In 2010 the original plan was to phase out fossil fuel-based power plants and substitute them by expanding the lifetime of the country's nuclear power stations by around 12 years. The Fukushima nuclear accident in March 2011, however, changed the attitude of the German public and officials to have a far more negative view on nuclear energy. The German government decided that all nuclear power plants would be brought down by 2022[157].

Germany has been successful in reducing their greenhouse gas emission in the last two decades and has reached both the Kyoto targets and the EU targets of 2020. The Energiewende includes a further 40 % decrease in emissions by 2050.[158] The key part of the Energiewende after 2011 has been natural gas, and Germany has multiple pipelines planned that will allow Germany to buy Russian gas directly. Gas was seen as a safer option than nuclear power, and cleaner than coal. The choice to increase the use of gas

[155] International Energy agency 2013b, 19
[156] International Energy agency 2013b, 11
[157] Russell & Wettengel 2017, "Germany's Energiewende: The Easy Guide Find your way around the energy transition."
[158] International Energy agency 2013b, 9

was also understood to be rational, as wind and solar power were not enough to reach the greenhouse reduction goals of 2020 and keep the country's industry competitive.[159]

Energy efficiency is extremely important for Germany, and the industrial and building sectors are the key sectors in which efficiency is promoted. The Energiewende has placed 10 billion EUR to be used as efficiency incentives for the industrial sector. The German government also has initiatives that promote renewable energy-based heating and energy efficiency for the building sector.[160]

Germany has a very complex and inflexible energy policy decision making and implementation system. Multiple ministries and state-owned companies have control on their respected areas of energy policy so the federal government cannot direct the country's energy policy as effectively as others. Germany does not have a single department responsible for energy policy, but rather it is a complex collaborative effort that includes the federal government and the German states (Länder). Energy policy legislation is done by the government, but the Länder are responsible for the implementation of the national law. The Länder also shape energy management and state committees. National energy policy decisions are mainly the responsibility of the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology (Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Technologie or BMWi). They are also responsible for maintaining security of supply and monitoring gas, oil and electricity supply. Renewable energy development and adoption is controlled by the Federal ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (Bundesministerium für Umwelt, NatuRSCThutz und Reaktorsicherheit). Their main task is to monitor the environmental impact of the energy sector. The German energy policy is also affected and guided by private energy corporations, of which many are partly owned by the German state.[161]

5.2 Statistics

Germany in 2011 had a total TPES of 311.8 million tons of oil equivalent. 32.7% of the TPES came from oil, 24.8% from coal, 22.3% from natural gas, 11.3% from renewables

[159] International Energy agency 2013b, 15
[160] International Energy agency 2013b, 33
[161] International Energy agency 2013b, 24

and 9 % from nuclear power. [162] In 2016 Germany's total TPES was 311.5 Mtoe. 32% of the country's TPES came from oil, 24% from coal, 23% from natural gas, 14% from renewables and 7% came from nuclear power.[163]

Germany is the third highest energy user by TPES of all IEA members, only behind the USA and Japan. Germany has the largest energy supply of all EU member states, but they have been reducing their TPES ever since reunification, and in 2011 the goal was set to lower the TPES of the country to 216.7 Mtoe by 2030. [164]

Oil is the main energy source in use in Germany, but its use has been in decline for over a decade. Germany is connected to the oil fields of Russia by the Druzhba pipeline, running through Ukraine and Poland. The oil market in Germany is highly liberalized and has many competing market forces.[165] Although oil is forecast by the government to be reduced in importance by 2030, it will still encompass 28.2 % of TPES. [166]

Coal is the second largest energy source in use in Germany. Hard coal and lignite are the only major domestic sources of energy in Germany, and in 2011 Germany was the largest producer of lignite in the world. The use of coal has stayed stable for some time and is expected to do so as the nuclear power fleet of the country is brought down. The main user of coal is the power sector which consumed over 90% of all lignite. The Government has, however, promised to end subsidies on hard coal by 2018. Lignite is expected to stay as a major energy source in Germany because of its low cost, energy security and ample supply.[167]

Natural gas is the third largest energy source in Germany, but one that holds the biggest political, environmental and economic questions. Germany is at the heart of the natural gas market in Europe, with pipelines ending and beginning in Germany. Natural gas is expected to become one of Germany's most important energy sources by 2030, when natural gas and LNG is expected to encompass 25% of TPES. Natural gas is the key energy source in the Energiewende especially after the decision to shut down all of the

[162] International Energy agency 2013b, 19
[163] IEA country statistics
[164] International Energy agency 2013b, 20
[165] International Energy agency 2013b, 10
[166] International Energy agency 2013b, 21
[167] International Energy agency 2013b, 21, 101

country's nuclear power plants. The environmental impact of natural gas use is politically charged in Germany, but it is also much cheaper and more energy efficient than renewable energy. Nearly all of the natural gas in Germany is imported, and Germany is Europe's largest natural gas importer. Natural gas is imported into the country mainly from 3 countries Russia (38%), Norway (22%), and the Netherlands (26%).[168]

Renewable energy is planned to become Germany's main energy source by 2030, if the government can continue their plans laid out in the Energiewende. The Energiewende sees renewables creating 33.2% of TPES by 2030, with biofuels, wind, solar, geothermal and hydro power being the planned methods. In 2011 biofuels and waste was the largest source of renewable energy in Germany, creating 8.5% of TPES. The rise of renewable energy in Germany has been substantial, with 2.3% of energy coming from renewables in 2000, to 11.3 % in 2011. The government plans to expand the country's wind and solar energy facilities further, as they only created around 1 % of TPES in 2011.[169]

In 2011 Nuclear energy created 9% of the TPES, with a decrease of 4.1% since 2000. The government plans to completely phase down all nuclear reactors by 2022[170], and in 2012 Germany had shut down 8 nuclear power plants, with 9 still operational. [171]

Germany has no domestic oil deposits, and in 2015 no commercial use of natural gas deposits. Because of their energy heavy industry Germany is highly dependent on imported fossil fuels. The country does have a very well developed and interconnected oil and gas infrastructure system that's connected to most central and eastern European energy markets. Germany also holds a 90-day oil reserve which surpasses the IEA requirements for security of supply. Germany also has the largest natural gas storage facilities in all of Europe and has plans to build LNG terminals in the future.[172]

[168] International Energy agency 2013b, 21
[169] International Energy agency 2013b, 21
[170] International Energy agency 2013b, 21
[171] International Energy agency 2013b, 171
[172] International Energy agency 2013b, 29-30

Germany imported 75.1 Mtoe of natural gas in 2011, and even with the world's largest coal production Germany still imported 32.7 Mtoe of coal in 2011[173]. Oil is the single largest import with 96.9 million tons of oil imported in 2011[174]. In 2016 Germany imported 91.2 million tons of oil, of which 39.5 % came from the Russian Federation. They imported 91.53 Mtoe of gas and 46.6% of it came from Russia. 53.6 million tonnes of coal was also imported of which 30.3% came from Russia.[175]

The largest consumer of energy in Germany in 2011 was the industrial sector, consuming 35.6% of the country's energy sources. Residential sector is the second largest consumer with 25.4% consumption, with the transport sector coming third with 24.5%. The German government plans to lower the total level of energy consumption as a part of the Energiewende.[176]

5.3 German energy policy before the Ukraine crisis

September 2010 saw the German government embark on an ambitious new energy policy initiative to reduce the country's energy consumption and reduce greenhouse emission by 80 to 95% by 2015. This Energiewende, as it is better known, set Germany on course for a fundamental and bold overhaul of the entire energy system of the country. By 2050 Germany plans to have an environmentally sustainable, reliable and affordable energy system which would be achieved through long-term and integrated strategy. The 2010 Energiewende is built on the integrated energy and climate programme of 2007. The goals of the original energy and climate programme are still the same, but the Energy Concepts main objective is to ensure a climate-compatible, reliable and affordable energy supply for Germany. The Energy Concept is seen to work together with the EU targets of greenhouse gas reduction, expanding renewable energies and increasing energy efficiency.[177]

[173] International Energy agency 2013b, 101
[174] International Energy agency 2013b, 89
[175] IEA country statistics
[176] International Energy agency 2013b, 23-24
[177] Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear safety; International Energy Agency. Policies and measures: Energy Concept

In 2011 the most pressing concern for the German government was the Euro-crisis which was feared to affect German economy and hamper the development of renewable energy.[178]

The Energiewiende was widely popular but the price of the project was questioned in public debate. Renewable energy is not suitable everywhere, and some German Länder were concerned that the price of energy might rise and hurt German industry. Most Länder do not have interwoven energy systems and infrastructure, so a federal approach first needed substantial and costly infrastructure efforts to update and build new energy infrastructure (especially in the east).[179] The government planned to make sure that the benefits of the Energiewende would be equally divided, even to those states that did not produce energy.[180] The Energiewende sees energy efficiency as the main way to achieve the ambitious reduction in the primary energy consumption down by 50% by 2050 (compared to 2008). Renewable energy was hailed as the future of energy in Germany, but the country's energy base was still strongly built upon fossil fuels, mainly oil, gas and coal. Unlike the integrated energy and climate programme, the Energy Concept had a planned roadmap that allowed the government to implement the needed changes. The Energy Concept has a multilayered approach to it and tries to include all affected parties to the decisions, and tries to offer environmentally friendly approaches to energy, but at the same time ones that are economically sound, so that growth and competition aren't affected. It has multiple energy policy goals such as securing the security of supply, combat against climate change and allow German industry to grow and stay competitive. The German government believed that the Energy Concept would make Germany a leading power in energy efficiency, environmental protection and competitive energy prices, and still maintain a high standard of living.[181]

The original Energy Concept of 2010 was, however, amended in 2011, after the March 2011 Fukushuma Daiichi nuclear accident. Originally nuclear power was a key component of the Energiewende, as the energy created from nuclear power was both affordable and greenhouse emission free. The events of March 2011, however, changed the public and political opinion against nuclear power, and it was decided that nuclear power would be completely phased out in Germany by the end of 2022. This decision

[178] International Energy agency 2013b, 20
[179] International Energy agency 2013b, 32
[180] International Energy agency 2013b, 12
[181] International Energy agency 2013b, 26

came into force on the 6th of August 2011 when the Bundestag (parliament) passed the 13th act amending the Atomic energy act. The new amendment was supported by the German reactor safety commission and the Ethics commission, as they saw that although extremely unlikely, a nuclear accident would be devastating to the German nation. It, however, became extremely clear that a radical reorganization of the country's energy supply would be needed, as nuclear energy was a vital part of Germany's energy supply. The Energy package of 2011 was needed to accelerate the efforts laid out in the original Energy Concept which outlined the expansion of renewables, grid expansion, further energy efficiency and funding for the new reforms.[182]

The phasing out of the nuclear reactors was a major challenge for the Energy Concept, as nuclear power provided 22.6% of the electricity used in Germany in 2010[183]. This new development was seen by some as a risk to German and European energy security, as even though the Energiewende aimed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and diversify energy sources, it has not allowed Germany to secure low carbon energy sources. The country was expected to become far more dependent on imported fossil fuels, especially Russian gas and oil, as the federal government had plans to stop all hard coal mining in Germany by 2018 and stop all subsidies on lignite.[184]

In 2013 Germany had the largest per capita carbon footprint of the EU, and the order in which the power sources were phased out caused controversy. According to John Rhys taking nuclear power offline before coal, was considered a policy failure, and was linked with the German government's risk assessment after effects of the Fukushima disaster. The original plan of cutting emissions was overshadowed by the immediate impact in public opinion after the events of March 2011 and by 2012 8 of the country's 17 nuclear plants had been shut down.[185]

Russian energy was seen as a reliable energy provider in 2012, and there was little to no concern of threats to the security of supply[186]. The German government continued to see

[182] International Energy agency 2013b, 27-28
[183] International Energy agency 2013b, 31
[184] International Energy agency 2013b,
[185] Rhys 2013
[186] Röhrkasten & Westphal 2012, 337

energy as a commodity, and not as a strategic resource[187]. The events of 2006 in Georgia and 2009 in Ukraine caused condemnation in Germany, but it did not radically alter the federal government's view of Russia being a reliable trading partner[188]. Because energy is understood as an economic and commercial commodity Germany is strongly against any involvement of NATO or other international actors in energy relations.[189] Energy experts in Germany have a view that energy security is mainly a civilian matter. Energy issues are to be decided by the markets and are not to be militarized which they argue only weakens the energy security of Germany.[190]

Historically Germany has seen Russia, and Russian energy, as trustworthy and that the German-Russian relationship is a special relationship. During the Cold War West-Germany was at the forefront of the conflict and they successfully eased tensions between the USSR and the West. This diplomatic attitude can be seen today in German relations to the USSR's successor state the Russian Federation. Trade is an important part of the German appeasement approach, and it is used to create mutual interdependence which Germany hopes will keep tensions to a minimum. This mix of trade and civilian power has been often dubbed "Ostpolitik" which has dominated German relationship with most eastern European countries. The core idea behind Ostpolitik has been the idea of change through interdependence (Wandel durch Verflechtung)[191]. Germany has often been unwilling to exert force in their foreign policy and has rather used trade as a tool to create interdependencies. This is one of the reasons why Germany became a champion of integration in the EU, but also why they have maintained Russian reliability as a trading partner. The special relationship with Russia is also seen as a part of the German security policy, as Germany can work as a mediator between NATO and Russia.[192]

EU attempts to create stronger inner markets for energy were at odds with Germany's way of doing energy trade and policy without consulting other member states or the EU. In the EU Germany did support climate and environmental policy initiatives, and the environmental policy aspect of energy was one of the only fields of external energy

[187] Röhrkasten & Westphal 2012, 329
[188] Röhrkasten & Westphal 2012, 328
[189] Röhrkasten & Westphal 2012, 336
[190] Röhrkasten & Westphal 2012, 336
[191] Dyson 2016, 503; Duffield 2016, 4288; Schroeder 2007, "Wandel durch Verflechtung."; Koeth 2016, 26
[192] Koeth 2016, 32

policy that Germany did not leave to the economic sphere.[193] German energy policy is interlinked with EU climate policy through the integrated energy and climate programme of August 2007. The programme was launched at the march 2007 European council of heads of state and government meeting that outlined an integrated European climate and energy policy. The meeting was done under the German presidency of the European council of heads of state and government, and outlined a strict policy of energy efficiency, greenhouse gas emissions and the development of renewable energy. The guiding principles of the programme were the security of supply, economic efficiency and environmental protection.[194]

The most important energy project between Germany and Russia, and one that holds the most political ramifications for German relations to other eastern European countries, is the Nord Stream natural gas pipeline project which saw its second line becoming operational at the end of 2012. Starting from Vyborg Russia and ending at Greifswald in Germany, the original 1222-kilometer sub-sea pipeline was laid out in 4 May 2011, and it became operational in 8th of November 2011.[195] The project is the result of cooperation between 5 energy companies, the Russian state-owned Gazprom, the German Uniper and Wintershall, the Dutch Gasunie and the French Engie company. Since 2012 the pipeline has a capacity of 55 billion cubic meters of natural gas. The Nord stream pipeline is operated under the special purpose company Nord Stream AG, with majority of it being owned by the Russian government owned company Gazprom (51 %).[196] The planning for an expansion to the Nord stream pipeline, dubbed Nord Stream 2, began in 2011. The plan was to double the capacity of the original project to 110 billion cubic meters of natural gas, and Nord Stream AG planned to build the extension through the territorial waters of Estonia or Finland.[197] The Nord stream project has been strongly opposed by many Baltic and Eastern European countries, mainly transit states of Poland and Ukraine for its energy security issues, but also by Sweden for the possible environmental concerns that the project might cause[198]. The

[193] Röhrkasten & Westphal 2012, 332
[194] International Energy Agency. Policies and measures: Integrated Climate Change and Energy Programme.
[195] Spiegel Online 2011, "Controversial Project Launched: Merkel and Medvedev Open Baltic Gas Pipeline."; Gloystein 2011, "UPDATE 1-Nord Stream to finish 1st gas pipeline Thursday 2011."
[196] Nord Stream: Facts and Figures
[197] Interfax-Ukraine 2012, "Nord Stream seeks to study Estonian economic zone in Baltic until 2015."; Gazprom "Nord Stream 2: A new export gas pipeline running from Russia to Europe across the Baltic Sea."
[198] Niemelä & Huhta 2008 "Baltic Sea gas pipe project meets large difficulties."

critics of the project had since the beginning seen the project as nothing more than Russian geoeconomics that aim to bypass Ukraine and Poland to undermine their positions as transit states[199].

5.4 German energy policy after the Ukraine crisis

The Russian aggression in Eastern Ukraine and the annexation in Crimea caused major condemnation from the German government and media. Chancellor Angela Merkel made strong statements condemning Russia's actions which were seen in other EU states as a sign that Germany was willing to assume leadership in the EU push against Russia. Germany, however, had their own face on the line. Russian aggression in Ukraine and their disregard of national borders was a sign that Russia had not been changed through trade towards a more democratic and peaceful nation, and that the special relationship that Germany and Russia had was, if not broken, on hold.[200] Merkel shocked some in Germany when she called for economic sanctions against Russia and asked both Germany and the EU to rethink their relationship with Russia. She did hope that the crisis could be averted through diplomacy rather than escalation.[201]

Germany took the leadership in the Ukraine crisis mainly because of their special relationship but also because they are seen as not very self-interested and are far more democratic than other great powers.[202] At the Munich Conference of 2014 Angela Merkel showed a far more active form of German foreign policy towards Russia, that did not rule out the possibility of military action[203]. Germany was still against any EU accession talks with Ukraine, as Angela Merkel's government feared that it might hurt the German-Russian relationship even further. The German government did, however, support the association agreement with Ukraine.[204] Merkel and Putin were speaking daily during the beginning phases of the Ukraine crisis. The downing of MH17 in July of 2014 was the event that ended the hopes of the German government that the crisis might be averted early through diplomacy.[205] Before the downing of the MH17 flight it was very uncommon to hear anti-Russian views on German media, and during the

[199] Siddi 2015, 4; Mazneva 2015
[200] Koeth 2016, 33
[201] Deutscher Bundestag 2014, "Chancellor Merkel threatens Russia with sanctions."
[202] Koeth 2016, 36-37
[203] The Guardian 2015, "Ukraine crisis will not be solved by military means, says Angela Merkel."
[204] Koeth 2016, 32
[205] European Council of Foreign Relations foreign policy scorecard 2015

opening phases of the Ukraine crisis Russian quests were twice as common on German news as Ukrainians.[206]

The German public were not as worried of Russia as many German politicians during the beginning phases of the conflict. A TNS survey made in March 2014 showed that 54% of German supported the annexation of Crimea, and 55% showed understanding for the Russian view that Ukraine and Crimea are part of the Russian zone of influence. What showed a divide between the German public, however, was that 60% of Germans saw the reactions of the West as appropriate, and the support for the sanctions rose from 54% to 65% after the downing of the MH17 flight.[207]

The German industry began to lobby against possible sanctions against Russia almost immediately after the crisis, especially sanctions against oil and gas imports[208]. The representatives of the German industrial and commercial interests in Eastern Europe and Russia, The Ost-Ausschuss der Deutschen Wirtschaft, saw that the damage done to Russian relations would be substantial, and saw no reduction to the animosity before the Minsk-2 peace agreement would be realized. The Ost-Ausschuss saw that the sanctions policy was to blame for the deteriorating trust between Russia and the West.[209]

There were also many prominent German political figures who were strongly against any sanctions against Russia. The former German Chancellor Gerhard Schröeder and Helmut Kohl and former Prime Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher were strongly against the sanctions and wanted Germany to continue dialogue, trade and diplomacy with Russia[210]. The Social democrat leader Frank-Walter Steinmeier also expressed his dissatisfaction with the sanctions, but after the annexation of Crimea he did show some criticism towards Russian[211].

[206] Madajczyk 2015, 23
[207] Der Spiegel online international 2014, “Dancing with the Bear Merkel Seeks a Hardline on Putin.”
[208] Deutsche wirtschafts nachrichten 2015, “German economy demands immediate stop of Russia sanctions.”
[209] Ost-Ausschuss - Osteuropaverein der Deutschen Wirtschaf 2015, “Wolfgang Büchele is the new chairman of the East Committee of German Business.”
[210] Krumm 2012, 114-124; Kirschbaum 2014, “Putin's apologist? Germany's Schroeder says they're just friends.”
[211] Belov 2015, 8

When it came time to formulate the sanctions against Russia, Germany was adamant that the Russian energy sector must be lefts outside the EU sanctions[212]. Russian oil and gas were seen as far too important for Germany, especially with the Energiewende still under way and German nuclear power plants being brought down. Germany, together with other anti-energy sanction member states, successfully limited the EU sanctions to exclude Russian energy, much to the dissatisfaction of many eastern European states.[213]

This reluctance to impose sanctions on Russian energy sector limited the effectiveness of the EU response. Germany was, however, in a position where it was too dependent on Russian energy to risk a possible energy crisis, even though Angela Merkel's government did push for the EU sanctions against Russia. In 2013 the CDU/CSU/SPD coalition were aware of the dangers of becoming economically dependent on Russia, even though the coalition was unanimous on continuing partnership with Russia. This was seen as some as the end of the Wandel durch Verflechtung (change through interdependence) policy, as Russia had not changed to a more democratic and peaceful society, and the interdependence had in fact turned into a German dependence on Russian gas and oil.[214] Some did not, however, believe that the change through interdependence doctrine was dead, but that it might have become even more important after the crisis. In 2015 Frank-Walter Steinmeier, the German foreign minister at the time, proposed that the EU should offer investment and energy concessions to Russia, rather than to continue the EU-Ukraine trade negotiations. The idea is that relations with Ukraine are confrontational, whereas appeasing Russia through trade might lead to the end of hostilities in the long run.[215]

The events after the annexation of Ukraine showed that Germany's rhetoric of Russia did not extend to actions on energy related issues. Although Merkel has taken a seemingly strong position against Russia in the Ukraine crisis, she did support Nord Stream 2 project. The view remained that the project was not political, but a business decision made by corporations not under the EU sanctions[216]. This position was backed by the parliament (Bundestag) which reassured Germany's that the project would not

[212] Oliver 2015, "EU Fails to Agree New Russia 'Sanctions."
[213] Benoit 2014 "Germany's Merkel Walks Fine Line in Russia Standoff"; Humphreys 2014, "Russia sanctions: Who will be hurt the most?."; Vinik 2014 "Why Germany Doesn't Want Sanctions Against Russia, in Two Chart."
[214] Dyson 2016, 503; Duffield 2009, 4288; Schroeder 2007
[215] Barker 2015, "Germany Pushes EU–Russia Deal to Avert Ukraine Trade Pact Tension."
[216] Steinhauser 2015, "Germany's Merkel Defends Russian Gas Pipeline Plan."

lead to further German dependency on Russian gas, but it will in fact help in the diversification of Germany's energy supply as according to the Energy Concept and the Energy Union.[217] In 2015 the German energy companies E.ON and Wintershall, in cooperation with Royal Dutch Shell, French ENGIE and Austrian ÖMV relaunched the Nord Stream 2 project together with Gazprom.[218]

The Nord stream 2 pipeline was still seen as a domestic, or an economic decision in Germany, and the main negative views that were expressed were the possible environmental impacts that the project might have, and the worries that the project might do considerable harm to Polish-German relations. The project has politically only been objected by the green party of Germany for worsening German relations with eastern European countries and worsening the dependency on Russian gas. There has also been criticism of the price of the project, as land-based pipelines are already operational and far cheaper. The German media made some comments of the possibility that Russia might use their "energy weapon" against Germany [219] .The German government has dismissed these views and maintains their position that Gazprom is a reliable economic partner and being the only major corporation able to provide Russian gas into Europe they maintain a competitive edge that is impossible to rival.[220]

Germany has since its unveiling in 2014 viewed the European Energy Union project through its own domestic energy policy projects. The Energiewende was still nowhere near completion, when the Polish Prime minister Donald Tusk introduced the concept of the Energy Union. Götz Reichert, the head of the energy division at the Centre for European policy said that Germany is facing multiple hurdles in their energy policy as it is. The phase out of nuclear power and the reforming of their power market all affect Germany's views on the Energy Union. He sees that Germany, as all member states, are in constant struggle with the EU when it comes to energy policy. Germany wants to maintain their own energy policy agenda's, whereas the EU wants more cooperation and convergence with other member states. Germany wants to maintain their own support system for renewable energy, and not go with the EU plan.[221] In 2014 Germany had to change its support for renewables and bring out a bidding system, so that their

[217] Deutscher Bundestag 2015
[218] Matalucci 2015 "Gazprom Signs Deals with E.ON, OMV, Shell for New Pipeline to Germany."
[219] Meister 2013, 31
[220] Heinrich 2016, 4
[221] Appunn 2015

energy policy would follow the EU's Environmental and energy state aid guidelines. Germany's industrial association are supportive of the EU wide push for a common energy policy, especially the common energy market. Hildegard Müller, chairwoman of the German Association of Energy and Water Industries said that security of supply in the electricity market needs a common approach. The BMWi and the Commission have not been as supportive of the Energy Unions capacity markets and have seen them as the "last resort" to maintain energy security. Germany is supportive of the Energy Union's idea of more gas and energy interconnections between member states, but the German government still maintains their position that collective gas purchases are a violation the rights of private energy suppliers.[222] In the German governments non-paper on the Energy Union Germany saw the internal EU energy market as the cornerstone of security of supply, and that joint gas purchases were against the liberalization of the gas markets. Together with the internal market the German government saw decarbonification and the reduction of energy demand as the key ways to achieve energy security.[223]

6 Poland

6.1 Overview

Poland is a central European country on the Baltic Sea and had a population of little under 38 million in 2015[224] which made it the sixth largest member state in the EU by population. It borders Germany, the Czech and Slovak republics, Ukraine, Belarus, Lithuania and the Russian Kaliningrad Oblast exclave. Poland is also the ninth-largest country in Europe.[225]

The Polish government places energy security high on its agenda and the use of domestic energy sources (coal, gas, oil) is common in all sectors[226]. Ever since the fall of the Soviet Union and the end of Communism in 1990 Poland has placed long term energy security and self-sufficiency as key goals of the state. Poland has the fifth-lowest TPES per capita among IEA member countries. The largest single energy user is the

[222] Appunn 2015
[223] German government 2015
[224] World Bank
[225] International energy agency 2016, 17
[226] Puka 2014,131-132

industrial sector and Poland has one of the largest heating systems in Europe. Coal is the main source of energy in the residential sector. [227]

There is a divided view in Poland about the future of renewable energy. Some see it as the answer to the country's energy security, whereas others see it a potential risk. Renewables in Poland are seen as direct competitor to coal which is seen as a reliable, cheap and in ample supply, whereas renewable energy is seen as expensive and unreliable. There is also a narrative in place where Poland is feared to become dependent on other EU member states if their switch to renewable energy, as the technology needed to maintain a high yield renewable energy system would have to come from foreign countries (especially Germany). Renewable energy also faces massive socio-economical problems when trying to reduce coal use. The coal industry is major employer in Poland, with over a 100 000 people being employed in coal mining and energy, and there would also be enormous costs to update the current energy transmission infrastructure.[228] Coal mining is also a very respected industry in Poland, with coal miners seen as more respected than doctors or professors in a 2016 survey[229]. Poland has tried to diversify and develop their domestic energy sources by investing in liquefied gas terminals and funding green coal technology.[230]

Since 2011 Poland has aimed to develop its domestic natural gas production. The achievements so far are the unbundling of the natural gas sector, the establishment of an independent system operator and bringing liquefied natural gas to the market. The new Świnoujście liquefied natural gas terminal is a step towards supply diversification, and in total encompasses a quarter of the country's natural gas demand.[231] Poland is also looking to exploit new shale gas deposits and has plans to build a Baltic gas pipeline which would allow Poland to connect with the Norwegian natural gas network. The project is planned to be ready by 2022.[232]

The Polish energy policy is firmly under governmental control, but powerful coal, oil and gas companies can have a say in energy policy and they lobby strongly for the use

[227] International energy agency 2016, 10
[228] Heinrich 2016, 2
[229] Poland's Public Opinion Research Center (CBOS)
[230] Ancygier 2013; Skjærseth 2014
[231] International energy agency 2016, 12
[232] Heinrich 2016, 4-5; Martewicz 2018 "Poland Waves Goodbye to Russian Gas After 74 Years."

of domestic fossil fuels. To combat the possible influence of corporations Poland created the Ministry of Energy in 2015 to coordinate energy policy decision making, and make sure that energy security is not compromised by economic or environmental issues. Before the creation of the Ministry of Energy in 2015 the Polish energy policy was coordinated by the Ministry of Economy, in coordination with other ministries. The Ministry of Energy was created after the Ukraine crisis and it sets out the legal framework for energy policy. It's tasks include the development and implementation of energy policy and security. The Ministry of Energy is also the asset owner of government owned energy companies and includes them in decision making. The Ministry of Environment is responsible for monitoring the carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of the energy secrot, and the approval of licenses for exploration and extraction of raw materials. [233] Poland also unveiled a new energy law in 2013[234]. The new law was implemented to adjust the energy sector to EU regulations on greenhouse emissions, but also to safeguard against threats to energy security which the Polish President of the Energy Regulatory Office describes as the "*long-term imbalance on the fuel and energy market"*[235].

EU directives and requirements are a key part of Poland's energy policy decisions, even though the Polish government does not always agree with the EU's energy and climate goals, but the country has ratified both the Kyoto protocol and the Paris climate agreement[236]. The EU is especially interested in forcing Poland to liberalize its gas and electricity markets and reach the EU greenhouse emission reduction goals. [237]

6.2 Statistics

In 2011 Poland's TPES was 101 Mtoe of which 56% came from coal, 25% from oil, 13% from natural gas and 6% from biomass [238]. In 2015 Poland's total TPES was 94.6 Mtoe, of which 50.8% came from coal, 24.5% from oil, 14.6% from natural gas and biofuels and waste creating 8.9%. Other renewables such as wind and hydro power created just 1.2 % of TPES. [239]

[233] International energy agency 2016, 23
[234] Polish Parliament 2013
[235] The President of the Energy Regulatory Office in Poland 2013, 37
[236] Polska 2015 'Polish PM signs Paris Agreement'
[237] International energy agency 2016, 23
[238] Polish Information and Foreign Investment Agency 2011, 1
[239] International energy agency 2016, 17

Currently Poland has no nuclear energy production, but there are plans to build reactors in the future. The government sees nuclear energy as a way to secure domestic energy and increase energy security. Nuclear energy would also help Poland reach its EU carbon emission reduction goals. The Polish nuclear power program which was approved in 2014, includes 2 nuclear power plants (6 000-megawatt and a 3 000-megawatt power plant) to be commissioned in 2022. If constructed these new plants would create 8% of Poland's energy needs.[240]

The use of hard coal and lignite are the foundation of the Poland's energy system and Poland's energy strategy, as they are both available domestically in large quantities. In 2015, coal provided over 50% TPES of Poland which is the second highest amount of all OECD countries.[241]

In 2015 oil was the second-largest energy source in Poland, with 24% of the country's TPES. Poland has some domestic oil production but almost all crude oil comes from other countries. The Russian Federation provides most of Poland's oil from the Druzhba pipeline and the Naftoport oil terminal in Gdańsk. Poland aims to build new pipelines to diversify its oil imports. New pipeline connections are a crucial part of Poland's future energy security.[242]

In the past few years Poland has had some progress in the development of renewable energy and its share in TPES increased from 5% in 2004 to 10.4% in 2014. Even though there has been some progress, renewable energy is facing pressure from political actors, as the threat of Russian energy dependency creates pressure to expand and update the country's aging coal power plants. The new Renewable Energy Act adopted in 2015, created a new an auction based regulatory process which the Polish government hopes will speed up the development of renewable energy.[243]

Poland is the region's second largest importer of energy after Germany, and in 2015 only coal production was enough to fill domestic demand. All of the country's oil and 66% of natural gas was imported, almost exclusively from Russia. In 2012, however, Poland was the least energy dependent EU member state, as it imported 25.8% of its

[240] International energy agency 2016, 12
[241] International energy agency 2016, 11
[242] International energy agency 2016, 12
[243] International energy agency 2016, 11

energy sources (EU average 53%).[244] Of the imports 96% of oil came from the Russian Federation in 2012[245]. In 2016 Poland imported 24.8 million tons of oil of which 83.7% came from Russia. Poland also imported 13.23 Mtoe of gas of which 74.3% came from Russia, and 8.6 million tons of coal of which 60.6% came from Russia. [246]

6.3 Polish energy policy before the Ukraine crisis

Polish energy policy in 2011 to 2014 was mainly governed by ministry of economy, but it was in many aspects a collaboration of multiple ministries such as the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of State Treasury. The most important goals and aspects of Polish energy policy were outlined in the document "*the Energy Policy of Poland until 2030*", or for short EPP[247]. The goals of EPP were: improved energy efficiency, the security of fuel and energy supplies, the diversification of electricity generation by nuclear power, development of renewable energy sources (mainly biofuels), strengthening of fuel and energy markets and the reduction of environmental impact of the energy sector[248].

Energy security was a key concern of the Polish government and was the main driving force behind all energy policy decisions[249]. Energy in Poland is often the matter of security policy. Energy dependency to Russia is a common political topic and all diversification and development of energy sources and infrastructure were important aspects of reaching energy security.[250]

In 2013 there were plans to build 2 nuclear power plants and a network of gas terminals (Both natural gas and LNG) and energy transit connections to neighboring countries, especially between Germany, the Baltic countries and the Czech Republic. There was also plans to build a possible North-South Gas corridor that would have connected the LNG terminals in Croatia with those of Central Europe. This expansion was a part of

[244] Sattich 2016, 794; International energy agency 2016, 21
[245] Paraskova 2018 "Poland Reduces Russian Oil Import Dependence, At A Cost."
[246] IEA country statistics
[247] Ministry of Economy 2009
[248] International energy agency 2016, 24-25
[249] International energy agency 2016, 11
[250] International energy agency 2016, 24

the Gaz-System plan which aimed to diversify Poland's natural gas imports so that the dependency on Russian gas would be broken completely[251].

Poland has been a difficult EU member state when making climate and energy regulation in the European Union. The country did not endorse the EU energy roadmap of 2050, and has strongly advocated against strong decarbonization goals, but internationally the country does take part in the fight against climate change[252]. Poland was able to reach the 2020 goals of 20% reduction in greenhouse emissions, but this was only achieved by implementing wide ranging changes to the country's industry, and these changes caused fears in Poland that security of supply might be at risk[253]. Being the tenth largest emitter of greenhouse gasses of all the OECD countries, Poland has found it difficult to fulfill its EU climate goals, as the costs to the Polish domestic coal and oil production hurt the overall economy.[254]

Poland outlined their national climate strategy in the National Strategy for Adaptation to Climate Change (NAS 2020). The framework was published in October of 2013 and it was meant to prepare the country for sweeping changes in energy production necessary for reducing greenhouse emission, without harming the socio-economic development. Climate change was seen as a major risk for the Polish nation, and the NAS 2020 saw the positive impacts that the reforms would have on the Polish environment and economic growth[255].

6.4 Polish energy policy after the Ukraine crisis

After the Ukraine crisis and the occupation of Crimea the Polish government and general public voiced full support of Ukraine and condemned Russian hostilities. Ukraine has been an important neighbor for Poland, and the Russian energy dependency threat has been a shared topic between the countries. The events that unfolded in the Donbas and Crimea were a sign for Poland that their fears of Russia were proven correct, and that energy dependency to Russia must end.[256]

[251] Gaz-System 2013
[252] International energy agency 2016, 44
[253] International energy agency 2014a, 44
[254] International energy agency 2016, 43; Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development 2016
[255] International energy agency 2016, 43
[256] Besier & Stokłosa (ed.) 2014, 6; Besier & Stokłosa 2017, 175-177

The Ukraine crisis caused a major energy policy review in Poland, and in 2014 the Polish ministry of economy gave the country 3 options for the future: 1) A balanced mix of all energy resources, 2) one based on nuclear energy and 3) one based on shale gas, LNG and renewable energy[257]. When the Law and Justice party came to power in 2015 they immediately said that they would not continue the gas contract with Gazprom in 2022 and would instead look to rid Poland of Russian gas imports[258].

The Ukraine crisis created strong rifts between the EU and Poland, as EU's actions were seen as too weak and divided in Poland. Ukraine became a part of Polish internal policy as the fears rose that the same events that happened in Ukraine could happen in Poland. The crisis allowed Poland to drive towards stronger securitization of key policy areas both domestically and in the EU, especially energy.[259] In the wider EU context Poland became far more assertive in energy security. Being the symbolic leader of the Visegrad group Poland began to support its own policy in the EU. In 2014 Poland was able to postpone the EU climate and energy goals of 2030, as the strong greenhouse emission reduction targets were in Poland's view far too dangerous for the country's coal, gas and oil-based energy production and industry, and would worsen their dependency on Russian fossil fuels. Together with the other Visegrad countries Poland was able to negotiate better terms in October of 2014.[260]

Although the first steps towards a common European energy policy date back to 2010, when the European energy community was proposed by the President of the European Parliament Jerzy Buzek and the former head of the European Commission Jacques Delors, it was Poland which had pushed for and had the greatest influence on the Energy Union. In 2014 the then Polish Prime minister Donald Tusk was a key advocate for a unified EU energy policy, and the Polish government wanted a common EU energy policy based around energy security in response to the Ukraine crisis and the ever-worsening European dependency on Russian fossil fuels. [261]

[257] Ministry of Economy 2014
[258] Martewicz 2018
[259] Zajaczkowski 2017, 1
[260] Ydersbond & Sveen 2014, "The Ukraine Crisis and European energy system transformation."; Skjærseth 2014,"Polish brake pad."
[261] Keay & Buchan 2015, 2; Jakóbik 2018 "The Energy Union is still attractive for Poland.", 2; Roadmap towards an Energy Union for Europe. Non-paper addressing the EU's energy dependency challenges 2014

The Energy union project was in the beginning know as a 'Polish idea' and the main debate was centered around joint gas purchases[262]. The Energy Union project received wide support from the EU member states as it placed security of supply high on the agenda. The project was also seen as an alternative to EU climate and energy policies which are centered around environmental and economic policy rather than security.[263] Poland wanted to push for a more securitized understanding of energy policy, as they had domestically, to confront the Russia's hostile actions towards Ukraine[264].

The original proposal that Poland had for the European energy union had six elements: 1). An effective solidarity mechanism that would be used in case of gas supply crisis; 2). Stronger EU funding of energy infrastructure, especially in the eastern EU. EU would fund up to 75 % of these projects. 3). Joint gas and oil purchases; 4). Rehabilitation of coal as a source of energy; 5). Shale gas extraction; 6). Complete diversification of gas supplies to the EU.[265] These original points made by Poland marginalized environmental factors, and strongly echoed Poland's own energy security interests. Poland had wanted to update their energy infrastructure and harness domestic energy sources for decades but had been stopped by the lack of funds and EU regulations on fossil fuels.[266]

When the Energy Union project reached the EU commission the Polish six points were shaped into 5 pillars: 1). Security of supplies based on the principles of solidarity and trust; 2). Competitive and completed internal energy market; 3). Reduction of the energy demand; 4). Decarbonization of the EU's energy mix; 5). Research and development of renewable energy. [267] The commission removed the rehabilitation of hydrocarbons and the joint energy purchases parts and replaced them with decarbonization and reductions in energy demand. This was a major blow to Poland's original vision on the Energy Union which would have secured their domestic energy supply and allowed the EU to use their joint purchasing power to counter Russian energy domination. These setbacks enforced Polish views that EU climate policy

[262] Szulecki 2016
[263] Beckman 2015, "The Energy Union: it's now or never for a European energy policy."
[264] Polish Government 2014, "Minister Grzegorz Schetyna on Polish foreign policy priorities."; Sikorski 2014 "Foreign Ministers of V4 Nordic and Baltic Countries Meet in Narva."; Reuters 2014, "Polish PM: EU should form energy union to secure supplies."
[265] The Chancellery of the Prime Minister 2014, "Donald Tusk in Brussels on energy security in Europe."
[266] Szulecki 2016
[267] European Commission. Building the Energy Union

actions (especially decarbonization) are as big of a problem as energy dependency, or that EU's climate policy is what has causes and maintains the dependency[268]. Poland especially views Germany's Energy Concept as not only as a domestic energy security threat, but as a threat to the entire EU[269]. Even though the Energy Union was changed considerably in the Commission, Poland was still strongly behind the project, as it did open EU level discussions on energy security. The then Polish Prime Minister Beata Szydło was able to revise the security of supply aspect of the Energy Union so that member states were required to hold stocks of hydrocarbons and have a solidarity mechanism in the event of a crisis[270].

Energy continued to be the most pressing policy agenda of the Polish government after the Ukraine crisis, and to simplify and enhance the country's energy policy decision making they created the new Ministry of Energy in 2015. The ministry was the result of years of negotiations and continues the efforts to diversify the country's energy production, enhance energy security and energy efficiency. The main legal framework for the new ministry were the EU directives and requirements, and the main goal was the reduction of the country's dependency of Russian energy. The energy ministry's policy in 2015 was the development of alternative fuel sources, the updating of infrastructure and the utilization of domestic energy sources.[271]

The single most important project for Polish energy security was the 2015 Nord Stream 2 project which caused a major political and public resistance in Poland. The Polish government maintains their view that the project is a Russian geoeconomical tool to strengthen their energy dominance in Europe and divert natural gas flow so that it bypasses both Poland and Ukraine. Poland, together with other Visegrad group countries, view the project as a direct threat to energy security. The project is seen with hostility, and together with energy security threats the project is deemed environmentally and economically harmful for Europe, and as a "'weapon' of hybrid warfare".[272] Poland also fears that the project would harm the country's ability to diversify and update their energy sources and infrastructure. The Polish government

[268] Ancygier & Szulecki 2014
[269] Heinrich 2016, 6
[270] Jakóbik 2018
[271] International energy agency 2016, 9, 24
[272] Heinrich 2016, 3; Radio Free Europe 2018, "Polish PM Calls Nord Stream 2 'Weapon' Of Hybrid Warfare."

argues that if they are not able to control the flow of gas to the EU, the new LNG terminal in Świnoujście could not compete against cheap Russian natural gas[273]. The former Polish Prime minister and president of the European council Donald Tusk addressed these concerns in his letter to the president of the European Commission Jean-Claude Juncker. He called the project a threat to both European security and climate policy and urged the European council and commission to halt the project. He also stressed that the Nord Stream 2 would be against the goal of reducing energy dependency set out in the Energy Union and would also harm Ukraine's and Eastern EU member states status's as transit countries[274].

7 Analysis

I will now analyze the energy policy development of the chosen member states to see how the crisis affected their energy policy development, what are the key energy security concerns and vital energy systems, and if the Energy Union can be considered a sign of an EU RSC. I will start by examining every state individually and then move to the comparative analysis.

7.1 Finland

After the Ukraine crisis Finland saw a rise in the amount of renewable energy from 26.5% to 32% and nuclear power use also rose slightly. The use of fossil fuels dropped, with natural gas being the biggest drop from 9,7% to 6%. Finland also lowered their imports from 77.8% of total TPES in 2011, to 45.33% TPES in 2016. The Finnish government aimed to reduce the amount of fossil fuels even more by expanding nuclear power and renewable energy in the near future.

The Finnish energy base is very dispersed, with oil, nuclear power, coal, renewable energy sources and peat all a major part of the energy base. This diversification creates the backbone of the Finnish energy security as the Finnish government could reduce energy imports and production in one sector by increasing another.

[273] Jakóbik 2018
[274] Toplensky 2017, "Tusk adds voice to calls for greater EU control over Nord Stream 2."; Shaffer 2009, 41

Before the Ukraine crisis Finland viewed Russian energy as a possible risk. The energy dependency to Russia was a continuous pressure point which the Finnish government aimed to reduce via domestic renewable energy sources and by developing further nuclear power stations and energy connections. Energy security was a concern in Finland prior to the crisis as the reliance on imported energy in the EU was more than half in 2012. Russian dominance in the crude oil, coal and natural gas markets were taken seriously, and Finland advocated for a common European energy policy that would consider the internal markets, as well as the issues of environment and sustainable development. At the time the Finnish government also looked to strengthen the Nordic energy market and linking Finland with the Baltic gas market.

The Finnish reactions to the Ukraine crisis were universally condemning towards Russia, but it's effects on energy policy were not immediate and substantial. Official and public debate about the subject was divisive, with fears of Russian energy domination alarming many media outlets and Finnish government officials, but the topic soon disappeared from both public and political discourse. Finland is in a difficult situation when it comes to Russian energy, and although Russian energy dependency was seen as a considerable risk by nearly all sectors of the society, the state believed that Finland can handle the situation via diversification, and only oil and gas were singled out as possible risks. The media and the public image turned against Russian energy purchases, but climate change was still seen as the most important aspect when formulating domestic energy strategy. The expansion of renewable energy sources was a way to tackle both climate change and energy dependency. Finland hoped that with the development of the Energy Union, and by reaching the necessary EU greenhouse gas reduction goals, Russian energy dependency could be reduced. Finland, however, does not want to completely sever its energy ties with Russia, as there is an almost common perception that keeping good relations with Russia also needs bilateral projects and trade.

The Finnish government created a separation between diplomatic and economic relations with Russia after the Ukraine crisis, as was shown by the actions of President Sauli Niinistö and also by Prime ministers Stubb and Sipilä. Russia was deemed a military threat and a political enemy of the EU, but officials in Finland still maintained the position that Russia is a reliable trading partner regardless of their action. Tuomas Iso-Markku from the Finnish Institute of International Affairs saw that there was a

consensus that trade with Russia must continue regardless of the threat, and as Finland's third biggest export partner, and main energy importer, Russia had an unrivaled position in Finnish trade policy. The EU sanctions on Russia were, however, supported by Finland, and as a result of the Russian military activity in the Baltic region, Finland boosted their military budget and strengthened their defense cooperation with Sweden and NATO. Finland also continued their strong support for a common EU defense and security policy.[275] The EU sanctions caused major fears in Finnish political and business circles, as Finland was economically far more dependent on Russia, than Russia was of Finland[276]. Finland, however, supported the EU sanctions in practice and in word, but at the same time continued to support eastern trade and tried to continue bilateral diplomatic relations with Russia.[277]

Unlike fossil fuels, Finland does not view nuclear energy of having immediate or long-lasting threat to energy security, as the security of supply of nuclear energy is far better than for gas or oil which can be cut immediately. The Fennovoima nuclear power plant project had a strong backing of the Finnish government from the beginning, with the only exception being the Green League party. Nuclear energy facilities are considered vital energy systems for Finland as the facilities are located on Finnish soil and are thus immune to energy cuts. Finland also views energy trade with Russia from much the same way as Germany; as a diplomatic tool. The decision to continue the Fennovoima project with Rosatom was shown to have a huge significance for the Finnish government as the partly state-owned energy company Fortum was needed to make sure the project would succeed. Rehns comments also show that there has been political pressure to make sure that the project will reach the necessary 60 % EU ownership criteria, as his sudden change of heart gives clear insight to the massive importance the Fennovoima project has for the Finnish government. The 60 % EU ownership criteria also coincides with Corry's riskification, as the Finnish governments safety margin was not meant to stop the project but to minimize the possible risks and also legitimize the project. Although the use of energy as an extension of diplomacy with Russia mirrors that of Germany's, Finnish academics, politicians and media are far more cautious than those in Germany, and there is a consensus that Russia is not as reliable of a trading partner as the top-level Finnish politicians say.

[275] Iso-Markku 2015
[276] Forsberg 2014, 115-116
[277] Besier & Stoklasa 2017, 95

When the Energy Union project came forth Finland supported the project as a way to secure the security of supply and help Finland connect with the EU energy market. Diversification of energy supplies is key to Finnish energy security, so as Finland aimed to reduce Russian fossil fuels, they needed alternative connections to gas and oil in order to maintain a high level of diversification of energy sources. The Balticconnector gas pipeline project shows that Finland doesn't view gas in general as a risk, but they do view Russian gas as a risk.

7.2 Germany

Germany has a huge energy base, with a TPES of 311.8 Mtoe in 2011, and 311.5 Mtoe in 2016. The amount did reduce slightly after the Ukraine crisis, but the level of decrease is nowhere near the necessary level envisioned in the Energiewende. Germany's import dependency rose considerably after the Ukraine crisis, and the phasing down of most of the country's nuclear power plants has seen the amount of imported gas has risen from 75.1 Mtoe in 2011 to 91.53 Mtoe in 2016. The amount of coal imported also rose from 32.7 MToe in 2011 to 53.6 Mtoe in 2016. The amount of oil imported dropped slightly from 96.9 Million tons in 2011 to 91.2 million tons in 2016. Germany has a plan to reduce the total TPES to 216.7 Mtoe by 2030, but to achieve this, radical changes would need to be implemented. The current plan is to shut down all nuclear power stations, improve on energy efficiency and boost up the use of renewable energy. The use of renewable energy has risen from 11.3% in 2011 to 14% in 2016, but the clearest rise has been in the rise of natural gas use. The use of natural gas is expected to rise considerably after the Nord Stream 2 pipeline becomes operational. The use of coal will also rise before the expansion of renewable energy sources becomes a reality

The Energiewende dominated the German energy policy field prior to the Ukraine crisis, and linked energy security with domestic decision making. Energy security in Germany was understood as one linked with oil and gas market fluctuations, that might cause sharp peaks in the price of energy. Also, the price of Energiewende and massive changes to the electricity sector were immediate, and the nation's energy grid was not prepared for the scale of the project. There were fears from all parts of the society that

the price of energy might rise, and cause damage to the German industry. This shows a sign that energy security was an economic concern, rather than strategic in 2011.

Even though Russia's actions after the Ukraine crisis were condemned by the German government and there were attempts of securitizing moves from both the media and political actor's, Russian energy continued to be a desecuritized issue in Germany, and energy cooperation continues between Germany and Russia, notably via the Nord Stream 2 project. Russia did not, however, remain as a friend in official rhetoric of Germany, but many in Germany hoped that the special relationship could be saved. As according to Buzan & Wæver, Germany still saw Russia as a friend in trade relations, but a lost or misguided friend in political relations. According to Karl Deutsch and Alexander Wendt the image of Russia is perceived in Germany as a part of a *"*pluralistic commonwealth of security*"*[278]. Good relations with Russia are key to keeping peace and maintaining energy security, and although conflict is possible, Germany sees that their function is to be the appeaser between the West and East. Continuing energy trade with Russia was an economic relationship between companies, but also a diplomatic mission that Germany hopes will mend the rift between the two countries. The German industry and major politicians all strived to desecuritize Russian linked energy after the crisis and Angela Merkel herself supported the Nord Stream 2 project despite showing strong leadership against Russian actions at the beginning of the crisis.

Marco Siddi sees that Germany has not completely abandoned Ostpolitik and that there is still a desire within the German economic and political circles to return to the special relationship between Germany and Russia[279]. The German political elite, namely Angela Merkel and former chancellors and Prime Ministers, continue to diplomatically engage Russia, and the flow of gas and oil continues without problems. Germany is a leading figure in the mediation of the Ukraine crisis, and countries like Poland, that wish to expand the sanctions to include energy, have been excluded from the process. Siddi sees that Germany has updated their strategy, rather than abandoned it. The new Ostpolitik is a combination of diplomacy, economic cooperation and maintaining international norms[280]. This new Ostpolitik can be understood as a doctrine of

[278] Madajczyk 2015, 22
[279] Siddi 2016b, 673-674
[280] Siddi 2016b, 675

desecuritization of Russian energy, where the unhindered flow of gas and oil are the cornerstones of German economy and diplomacy between Germany and Russia.

With Russian energy not included in the EU sanctions, Germany was able to continue its energy projects with Russia and maintained their view of Russia as a reliable trading partner. Russian energy was successfully desecuritized after the initial shock and energy dependency was played down as a threat to the country. Nuclear power continued to be securitized after the crisis, as was coal power for environmental reasons. As natural gas and oil were the only non-securitized energy sources available, Germany had no possibility but to block Polish attempts to include Russian gas or oil in the sanctions. German political doctrine was also strongly based on the idea that good relations with Russia are the key to energy security. Germany did not see that Russian energy became a risk or a threat after the Ukraine crisis. What happened in stead was a securitization of the possibility that Russian energy would stop if relations with Russia would deteriorate between Germany and Russia.

Germany does not trust that Poland, with their securitized view of Russian energy, should stay as the main pathway of Russian energy, as this places Germany and their industry in a precarious situation where Polish-Russian relations would determine German energy security. Nord stream 2 is a way for Germany to safeguard their own energy security and energy self-determinations. Germany sees the Nord stream pipeline in its entirety as a vital part of their energy security, as it diversifies their transit routes, and cuts out the middle man. The crisis in Ukraine, the hostile Polish-Russian relations and the aging eastern European gas and oil transit infrastructure were in German eyes a greater energy security concerns than any dependency on Russian energy.

Germany has a strong view that renewable energy is not a threat to energy security, on the contrary they see it as the answer to energy security issues[281]. They see nuclear power as a threat to both environmental and energy security, even though greenhouse gas emissions and dependency on Russian gas and oil is brought up frequently in German media, and climate change is a securitized issue. Anti-Nuclear views have always been much more popular in Germany, than in other EU member states, and the 2011 Fukushima disaster caused enough public outcry to force the government to

[281] Heinrich 2016, 2

abandon nuclear power entirely. Germany does not see that their domestic energy policies are anything other than internal policy decisions and are strongly against any other EU member state meddling in their internal policy issues[282]. The lack of internal transit infrastructure is a major threat to German plans to make renewable energy the major energy source in the entire country, and the expansion of the use of shale gas is on hold, as it is viewed as a competitor of renewable energy. All in all Germany maintains a view that all energy security threats can be answered via technology, new infrastructure and by turning Germany into a transit state.[283]

Currently Germany seems to have no clear way of cutting their import dependency, but as seen in the reactions of German politician and industry representatives to the Ukraine crisis and EU sanctions, there are many who do not see import dependency as a threat or even a risk. The change through interdependency doctrine sees that dependency goes both ways, and if Germany is able to become the main transit country of Russian gas into Europe, Germany could use their transit country status to strengthen their bilateral relations with Russia and use their importance as an energy importer as a diplomatic tool. The threat of Russian energy dependency is played down in Ostpolitik thinking, but as Wæver has pointed out, desecuritization could hamper Germany's ability to counter possible threats in the near future[284].

7.3 Poland

Poland reduces their total TPES from 101 Mtoe in 2011, to 94.6 Mtoe in 2015, with the use of fossil fuels decreasing and the amount of renewables increasing. Currently Poland is the second largest importer of energy in the region, but they are also one of least energy import dependent EU member states. Poland does import nearly all of their oil and gas from Russia, but this number has been reducing year by year. The amount of oil imports reduced from 96% in 2012 to 83.7% in 2016, and Poland aims to cut their natural gas trade with Russia all together by 2022, by a combination of LNG terminals, shale gas and connecting to other natural gas producing countries like Norway.

[282] Heinrich 2016, 3
[283] Heinrich 2016, 4-6
[284] Wæver 1999

Before the Ukraine crisis Poland did not hold Russian linked energy as much of a threat, but more of a risk. Energy security was, however, a major part of Polish energy policy agenda as Russian energy dependency was a common topic, as was the aging infrastructure and the lack of diversity of energy supplies. The goal was that Poland could reinforce their energy security via new energy connections and by utilizing nuclear power, domestic energy sources and new renewable energy sources. Both the German Energiewende and the EU climate regulations were seen as risks for Poland's energy security, but the issue was not yet seen as acute and instead the Polish government worked through EU channels to try and affect the decisions to their favor. There was yet no need for a direct governmental oversight of energy policy in Poland, and energy markets were liberalized.

The Ukraine crisis caused Poland to view Russian energy as a traditional security threat, and the threat of energy disruptions became a key part of Polish foreign and defense policy. To combat Russian energy dependency effectively Poland saw that the entire EU needs to work together to achieve energy security, and the German Energiewende was believed to undermine the energy security of the entire EU. This is most evident in the number of Polish academic articles criticizing German plans of greenhouse gas reduction, nuclear phase out and natural gas purchases from Russia[285]. The riskification soon developed into full securitization of energy in Poland, and total governmental oversight and protective measures were put in place. This slow movement towards securitization of energy in Poland, coincides with Szuleckis view that energy does not necessarily need a speech act to be securitized, but is in fact a mechanism. The Copenhagen school version of securitization does somewhat, however, work with Poland, as there were clear speech acts to identify the threat, actions taken to prevent it and the breaking free of rules. There was not, however, a single speech act, as the Polish energy policy field had been moving towards securitization for some time, and the Ukraine crisis was a transition point where Russian energy turned from a risk to a threat. Energy had been exceptionalized in Poland even before the crisis, and, as according to Szuleckis view, when it unfolded Poland's interpretation of the event led to total securitization of energy. This gives stronger support for the idea of energy securitization being a mechanism.

[285] Ćwiek-Karpowicz 2012; Jakóbik 2018; Gawlikowska-Fyk 2018; Madajczyk 2015

Poland placed domestic energy, new energy connections and EU cooperation as the key methods of obtaining energy security. They tried to create a regional security complex within the EU by securitizing Russian energy but were met with limited success. The Energy Union was approved, but not as the energy security-based institution they hoped. The inner markets and the upholding of security of supply did pass and were successfully riskified by the EU around the security of energy supplies, but the main goal of common gas purchases was strongly opposed by many other member states and did not become a part of the final version of the Energy Union. Poland had hoped that the Energy Union would allow them to continue their own energy policy track, and at the same time spread their securitized vision of energy security to other member states. Poland needed to form a regional security complex around Russian energy, as Poland could not maintain energy security if other EU member states continued to push for strong climate policy initiatives, that harmed Polish domestic coal industry, and continued to purchase their gas and oil from Russia bilaterally.

Nord stream 2 pipeline shows how strongly securitized Russian natural gas became in Poland. The Polish view is that the project will harm Poland, Ukraine and the entire EU. The fact that Germany chose to continue the project after the Ukraine crisis caused Poland to view Germany as much of an energy security threat as Russia. Being in a key position between central Europe and Russia, Poland has benefited from being a key transit route of oil and gas. Poland sees any alternative gas or oil pipelines not only as economic threats but as security threats. Being a transit country has given Poland considerable leverage against Russia in gas disputes, but any alternative routes would eliminate Poland's ability to stand against Russia, being itself dependent on Russian gas and oil. Although Poland is not as dependent on Russian gas and oil as some other EU member states, they are in a worse position when it comes to energy infrastructure, alternative sources of energy, development of renewable energy and connections to European energy markets.

The NAS 2020 showed how Poland is able to implement EU climate policy, but it too had a security policy-oriented angle. NAS 2020 saw the development of renewable energy sources as the way to update the country's aging energy infrastructure and which could help in cutting dependency to Russian fossil fuels. The updating of the energy sector can best be seen in Poland's attempts to develop carbon capture technology and

green coal power plants, but the phasing down of coal power is not up for debate. Poland has securitized nearly all their energy resources after the crisis, but there is still debate if renewable energy is an energy security threat or if it's the solution to the threat. Currently Poland views renewable energy as a hinderance and a distraction that takes valuable resources away from more pressing threats than climate change. There is also the risk that Poland could become technologically dependent on Germany and be sucked in the same problems that have engulfed Germany after Energiewende, namely greater dependency on Russian natural gas.

7.4 Comparative analysis

The reasons for securitization, desecuritization or riskification of Russian energy vary significantly between the three member states. There are geographical, economical, sociological, cultural, political and technical reasons how states choose the logic and the way of application of energy policy.

7.4.1 Energy Security

Finland sees energy security interlinked with EU energy and climate policy and sees energy security as a part of security policy. There is an understanding that energy security is both low vulnerability of vital energy systems, but also that energy security needs affordability and reliability which shows in the Finnish view that cheap Russian energy is needed but should also be seen as a possible risk. Here Finland's understanding of Russian energy coincides with Polands securitized view, but unlike Poland, Finland does not view all Russian linked energy with distrust, but only fossil fuels.

German energy security is to continue the flow of affordable and reliable energy by securing their energy systems by taking control of the transit infrastructure, effectively bypassing Poland and Ukraine. This in turn is seen as an attack on Poland's energy security as Poland sees their energy security as all-encompassing, with the security of domestic energy production and transit infrastructure as the main vital energy systems. Germany does not have as strong of a view of the importance of diversification as Finland or Poland has, and renewable energy is the main German method of gaining energy security, with natural gas working as a political sensible and economically

affordable second option. Germany sees nuclear power in the same way that Poland sees renewable energy; a threat to the development and expansion of other energy sources.

Poland sees energy security as a key part of their national security policy with domestic energy sources, EU cooperation and gas and oil pipelines being the most important aspects of Polish energy security together with domestic coal. Climate policy is subservient to energy security and is even viewed as a competitor to energy security. The reliability of energy is an important part of this, and Poland is willing to see the affordability of energy drop to achieve total energy security from Russia. Poland and Finland see Russian linked energy as more of a threat and agree on nuclear energy being the answer to energy dependency, as is the utilization of domestic energy sources. In order to secure Poland's energy security, they would need to keep their status as the main transit country, and make sure that all other EU member states join together to combat Russian energy domination. Finland differs from Poland in the fact that they want to maintain trade relations with Russia as part of their diplomacy, a view which Poland does not share.

Energy projects with Russia are an important part of Finland's bilateral relations with Russia, and the Fennovoima nuclear powerplant project has very similar reasoning behind it as Germany has with Nord Stream 2. Unlike Germany, Finland understands that they would be in no position to counter Russian geoeconomic actions if the level of dependency would become higher. Alternative sources of energy are needed from nearby countries, domestic energy sources must be utilized, and diversification must be achieved to maintain energy security. The Finnish and German views on Nord Stream 2 also show that Polish energy security concerns are not shared amongst other member states, rather both Germany and Finland view their own interests lying in continuous energy trade with Russia, although in Finland's case this only applies to nuclear energy. Germany has a strong view that energy security means continuous energy trade with Russia, and the end of this trade would be a disaster for German industry and energy security.

Unlike Poland, Finland does not have the necessary domestic energy resources to completely rid themselves of Russian energy, but both countries understand the necessity of diversification and utilization of domestic energy sources. Finland sees

security of supply as holding the necessary stocks, diversification of energy supplies and averting energy dependency on Russian fossil fuels, but at the same time not severing all their energy ties so not to create a political crisis between the two countries. Finland sees energy trade with Russia as an important part of bilateral relations in the same way as Germany. Poland has all the necessary domestic fossil fuels they need to cut their dependency, but this goes against the EU climate change regulations. Publicly Finland sees the reductions in fossil fuel use as part of the EU greenhouse gas emission reduction goals which could mean that they see the goals as a handy way of reducing Russian imported fossil fuels without harming bilateral relations.

The Finnish government utilizes their partially state-owned energy companies in a similar kind of fashion as Germany; a way to bypass political scrutiny by making energy projects a part of the free market and thus politically insulated. Fortum and Fennovoima are both partially state owned, as are German energy companies of Uniper and Wintershall, and both countries use the same method of justifying bilateral energy trade: the corporations are the ones taking part in the projects, not the governments. Poland has taken complete control of their energy market from the free market, and energy policy is dictated by the government. Political control of energy policy is present in all of the three member states, but Polish political control is the most direct. Finland and Germany steer the national energy policies towards their objectives via state owned corporations and political decision making.

7.4.2 Securitization/Desecurtization /Riskification of Russian energy

For Finland Russian energy is riskified, as there is some level of acceptance of dependency, beyond which the issue becomes a threat. The 60% EU ownership in the Fennovoima nuclear powerplant project for example follows Olaf Corrys view of riskification, as it is a way of building in a safety margin for Russian energy ownership. Finland also sees limiting Russian fossil fuel use and diversifying their energy base as a way to build national resilience which is the main way of combating long term risks. The audiences in Finland are generally on the line of riskification, but the scientific audience is very close to being securitized. The elite, popular and technocratic audiences all follow general desecuritized/riskified approaches, where the threat of Russian energy is necessary, but it is seen as a possible risk that needs close attention.

For Germany Russian energy is desecuritized, and there is a strong view in Germany that the securitization or riskification of Russian energy is itself a threat. Energy is a commodity and part of economic policy rather than security policy, but the government does have their own goals of reaching the necessary greenhouse gas reduction goals of the Energy Concept and making sure that bilateral energy trade with Russia can continue uninterrupted. The dominant view is that currently there is no alternative to Russian gas or oil, and that any actions taken to securitize them will in fact bring about the energy crisis that securitization or riskification of the issue would try to prepare for. Germany hopes that by deepening their dependency to Russia, they would in turn become too important of a trading partner for Russia which in turn would discourage Russia from using energy as a geoeconomic tool. In the long run, Germany might also hope that the Russian energy will be reduced when the Energy Concept is developed further. The German audiences are almost unanimously desecuritized, with only a few instances of riskification, by the media and academics. The early parts of the Ukraine crisis saw some speech acts aimed at securitizing Russian energy, but even Angela Merkel, who was strongly against Russian actions in Ukraine, sided with the desecuritized view of Russian energy.

Russian energy was completely securitized in Poland after the Ukraine crisis, and unlike Finland, Poland did not wish to continue bilateral trade relations with Russia on any energy projects. Russian energy needed to be completely phased out, and Poland used exceptional methods to gain the necessary governmental control to achieve this. The new ministry of energy gave the Polish government total control of the energy sphere in the country and reduced the liberalization of the energy market. EU climate policy was no longer a concern for Poland, as the country aims to increase domestic coal and gas use. Polish audiences are the polar opposite of that of Germany, and the elite, popular, technocratic and scientific audiences all show signs of securitization. The scientific audience critizises German energy policy, the popular view is very strongly against Russian energy domination and support domestic coal use, and the technocratic and elite are guiding Poland towards total abandonment of Russian energy.

7.4.3 Energy Union

A common EU energy policy is something that all of the three member states wanted, and saw as necessary for European energy security. The Energy Union was welcomed by all as a major project, but there were, however, major internal differences on the nature of the Energy Union, and what a common energy policy should be.

Germany and Finland saw the Energy Union as a way to form a much stronger internal energy market in the EU and open up a forum in which energy policy could be discussed. Germany especially wanted the Energy Union to move forwards climate change mitigation plans. The Energy Union could also be used to create stronger integration and move towards a common understanding of energy policy in the EU. Finland saw that the Energy Union is necessary to achieve energy security, and even saw that it must have a major say in the energy relations of member states and Russia. For Poland a common EU energy policy is needed to secure their domestic energy security, as the EU is the only institution that could stop Germany from diminishing their status as a transit country. Bilateral energy trade with Russia is also seen by Poland as something that harms all European states equally as it pushes countries against one another and makes it impossible for domestic energy sources to compete with cheap Russian fossil fuels.

7.4.3.1 Energy Union a sign of an RSC?

To see if the Energy Union has been the result of a regional security complex built around Russian energy dependency the member states will now be examined via the 4 variables:

1) Boundary: The main boundary of the EU runs along the EU-Russia border with Finland and Poland both being boundary states where as Germany is not. The Nord Stream 2 project will effectively turn Germany into a boundary state as the direct connection of energy without transit states will turn Russian-German relations into a direct energy relation. Finland and Poland, however, differ in their view of bilateral relations to Russia but converge in many ways in their views on Russian energy. Unlike Poland, Finland does not see that bilateral energy trade with Russia should be completely stopped and see their energy relations with Russia as necessary yet risky.

2) Anarchic structure: The EU comprises of 28-member states, with each state having their own energy policies and political alliances. Finland continues to see Russian bilateral relations as an important part of their economic and security policy. Finland is a member of the Nord pool and the Nordic cooperation but is also trying to expand southward to link their energy network with the Baltic region. Germany is the de-facto leader of the EU, especially after the Ukraine crisis, and most member states in the EU follow Germany's path when it comes to renewable energy development and foreign policy relating to Russia (sanctions, but continuing bilateral energy relations). Germany does, however, see their relations with Russia as a special relationship and although being the spiritual leader of the EU, they distance themselves from the Union when doing bilateral relations with Russia. Poland is the leader of the Visegrad group and has since the Ukraine crisis pushed for their own security and energy policy interpretations in the EU via the Energy Union. Poland and the Visegrad group form a distinct political entity within the EU which is often at odds with the EU over greenhouse gas reduction goals but are split over the role of Russian energy.

3) Polarity: The strength between the member states vary significantly, with Germany having the most political and economic power in the EU. Finland is a relatively weak member state, and they tend to follow Germany's lead on energy and climate policy. Poland has a strong position within the Visegrad group, but in the EU, they are in the minority when it comes to political and economic power. Their securitized vision of Russian energy and energy security are not shared by most member states and they do not have the necessary political power to shape the Energy Union into the RSC they vision.

4) Social construction: Both Germany and Poland see each other's vision of energy policy as problematic and as a threat to their own energy security. Finland and Germany agree on most areas, especially with bilateral Russian energy trade, but Finland also has apprehensions of Russian energy dependency along the lines of Poland. The Energy Union is thus understood very differently by all three-member states. Poland views it as a tool to unify EU energy policy to combat Russian energy dominance, whereas both Finland and Germany see it as an

economic forum which will create a unified EU energy market and guide the development of renewable energy sources. It will not, however, affect national energy policy decision beyond this or hamper bilateral energy trade, as long as the Energy Union does not include ways of enforcing member states to limit their use of Russian fossil fuels.

These variables show that the Energy Union is not in fact a sign of a centered RSC development within the EU, but rather a sign of internal transformation towards greater disintegration and enmity among the units. The Ukraine crisis showed that the view on Russian energy is split between those that view it as a threat (Poland), those that see it as a risk (Finland) and those that view it as desecuritized and a necessary part of EU energy security (Germany). Poland has already shown signs that it has securitized Russian linked energy and has split to form its own sub-RSC around this perceived threat. Even though Finland is a boundary state and see Russian energy as a risk, they see their position as far too precarious and their domestic energy security includes good relations with Russia. The German line of energy cooperation seems to be the best option to keep Finland from alienating themselves within the EU (e.g Poland), and to maintain their energy security. Germany will continue to push their vision of energy trade which is that every member state can form their own bilateral energy trade relations with Russia, if they follow EU climate policy and do not meddle in other member states energy policy. The unhindered flow of energy to the EU is the main goal of Germany, at least as long as the Energiewende reaches its goal of total renewable energy production. This will push Poland further into its own view of securitized Russian energy, and it has already shown signs that Germany, and maybe even countries like Finland, are a threat to their domestic energy security, as well as to EU energy security. This shows that Judge and Maltby's view of securitization leading to greater disintegration can happen. This has been caused by the rise of energy securitization in Poland, but also by the completely different interpretations of the energy security by countries like Germany and Finland.

The Energy Union will continue allowing states to purchase energy from Russia bilaterally, and focuses its efforts on slowly developing diversification of energy sources and maintaining climate change regulations on member states. This will alienate

member states like Poland which wish to see a more assertive Energy Union and a unified EU response against Russian energy domination.

8 Conclusions

The Ukraine crisis showed that politically all the member states had a common view on Russian aggression, but there were major differences about Russian energy after the crisis. Energy dependency was a major talking point in all of the member states, but the actions needed to combat it, or not, were not uniform.

The Ukraine crisis showed Finland that there is a threat related to Russian fossil fuels, such as gas, coal or oil which could in theory be used as a geoeconomical weapon. Nuclear energy was not seen as an immediate threat, but more of a potential risk which after consideration by the government was deemed a necessary risk. The country's energy security would be achieved by securing Russian-Finnish relations via common energy projects and by diversifying the energy base of the country to such an extent that no single energy source could be used as leverage.

Germany was shocked by the Ukraine crisis, and there was a period of political and social contemplation if its vision of change through interdependency had been misguided or not. The German government had successfully pushed their own securitized view of climate change to the EU, but they were unsure if Russian linked energy and dependency were a threat to them or the EU. When the time came to formulate the sanctions, Germany had chosen to follow the old doctrine, and was able to use their power in the EU to exclude Russian energy from both the sanctions and shape the Energy Union to better suit their needs. This was either because Germany could not sever energy ties to Russia without doing considerable harm to themselves after the Energiewende, or because there was still the hope that by monopolizing energy dependency to just Germany, they could gain the power to dictate energy policy between the EU and Russia, without having to rely on other member states with different ideas of energy policy. The nation's energy security and security of supply would be achieved by taking Germany deeper into Russian energy dependency, hoping that Germany could withstand any Russian geoeconomic actions.

Poland saw that they were proven correct by the Ukraine crisis, and that their securitized vision of Russia and Russian energy was vindicated. There were major internal developments inside Poland to push for further production of domestic energy sources, and all energy policy decisions were placed under governmental control. Poland began to boldly push their vision of energy security to the rest of Europe, and met with some early success, but were cut short from achieving a united EU energy policy based on their values. After the failure to achieve the unified energy policy in Europe Poland began to view German energy policy not only as a rival to their vision but as a threat to the energy security of the entire EU. The goal was to continue pushing for the more securitized view of energy policy, and at the same time secure Poland's energy security by ridding the country of all Russian linked energy by any means necessary, even if it meant failing the EU climate change mitigation plans and creating a conflicting sub-RSC within the EU.

The Energy Union in its current form does not lead to a unified EU regional security complex and energy policy integration. It is a compromise between very different member states, with their own interpretations of energy security. The Energy Union has its roots in Polish energy securitization, but the different interpretations of what is needed for energy security and the variations in vital energy systems and socio-economic environments make it even after the Ukraine crisis an impossible task to unite the EU member states behind a common energy security threat. The original securitized moves made by Poland did not lead to this securitization of Russian energy spreading in the EU.

The points in the Energy Union agreement can be used to mitigate both Russian linked energy, and climate change if a state wishes so, but it does not require any member state to change their own energy policy or give the EU a unified response to Russian energy domination.

The results of the study show that the energy policies of different EU member states can have huge repercussions on the integrity of the EU. There is a clear need for a unified EU energy policy, but as was shown in this study that can't be achieved without harming either energy sovereignty or energy security. Energy security needs of member states are often at odds with one another, and whatever direction the Energy Union will

take, it will alienate many member states as it will, in their view, undermine their domestic energy security. The EU needs to strengthen the Energy Union so that it may stop member states from harming one another's energy security, but also work towards a common EU energy policy that takes the energy security needs and threats into equal consideration. The Energy Union already works as a forum in which member states can discuss energy security issues. It remains to be seen if a common understanding of European energy security can emerge as the wedge of Russian energy has divided the EU from within.

9 References

Adomaitis, N. & Ercanbrack, A. (2015) "Finnish nuclear investor faces scrutiny over Russia link". *Reuters*, 1 July 2015. Available at: https://af.reuters.com/article/commoditiesNews/idAFL8N0ZH30620150701?sp=true. Accessed: 14 October 2018

Alastalo, S. (2016) "Foreign minister Soini: Russia is not a military threat". *Demokraatti*, 17 June 2016. Available at: https://demokraatti.fi/ulkoministeri-soini-venaja-ei-ole-sotilaallinen-uhka. Accessed: 5 November 2018

Ancygier, A. & Szulecki, K. (2014) "A common renewable energy policy in Europe? Explaining the German-Polish Policy Non-Convergence." ESPRi Working Paper No. 4. 1 April 2014.

Ancygier, A. (2013) "Misfit of Interests instead of the 'goodness of fit?" Implementation of European Directives 2001/77/EC 2009/28/EC in Poland. 7 February 2014. Hertie School of Governance. New York University

Andersen, S. S. & Goldthau, A & Sitter, N. (Ed.) (2017) *Energy Union Europe's New Liberal Mercantilism?* Palgrave Macmillan UK

Anthony, M. C. & Emmers, R. &Acharya, A. (2006*) Non-traditional Security in Asia: Dilemmas in Securitization*. Routledge.

Appunn, K. (2015) "Germany views European Energy Union proposals through Energiewende lens." *Clean Energy Wire*. 25 February 2015. Available at: https://www.cleanenergywire.org/news/germany-views-european-energy-union-proposals-through-Energiewende-lens. Accessed: 2 November 2018

Apunen, M & Haavisto, I & Sipola, J & Toivonen, S (2015) "Ken on maassa jämäkin?" EVAn Arvo- ja asennetutkimus 2015. *Helsinki: Taloustieto Oy.* Available at: https://www.eva.fi/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Ken-on-maassa-jamakin.pdf. Accessed: 15 October 2018

Baltic connector. Available at: http://balticconnector.fi/fi/projekti/. Accessed: 23 October 2018

Balzacq, T. (2011) "A theory of securitization: Origins, core assumptions, and variants." *Securitization theory: how security problems emerge and dissolve*. Routledge.

Balzacq, T. (2005) "The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context." *European Journal of International Relations*, Volume 11, Issue 2, June 2005.

Barker, A. & Wagstyl, S. & Olearchyk, R. (2015) “Germany Pushes EU–Russia Deal to Avert Ukraine Trade Pact Tension.” *Financial Times*, 1.12.2015. Available at: https://www.ft.com/content/4ee93654-9840-11e5-9228-87e603d47bdc. Accessed: 26 October 2018

Barroso, J. M. D. (2011) “Statement of President Barroso at the pre-European Council debate”, Brussels 2 February 2011. Available at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-11-64_en.htm

Beck, U. (1999) *World Risk Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beckman, K. (2015) “The Energy Union: it’s now or never for a European energy policy”. *Energypost*. 18 February 2018. Available at: http://energypost.eu/energy-union-now-never-european-energy-policy/. Accessed: 8 November 2018.

Belov, V. (2015) “Zum Russland-Diskurs in Deutschland”, *Russland-Analysen*, NR. 300. 17.07.2015. Available at: http://www.laender-analysen.de/russland/pdf/RusslandAnalysen300.pdf. Accessed: 27 October 2018

Benoit, B. & Thomas, A. (2014) “Germany’s Merkel Walks Fine Line in Russia Standoff”, *Wall Street Journal*, 3.3.2014, Available at:https://www.wsj.com/articles/germanys-merkel-walks-fine-line-in-russian-standoff-1393883692. Accessed: 25 October 2018

Besier, G. & Stoklasa, K. (2017) *Neighborhood perceptions of the Ukraine crisis: From the Soviet Union into Eurasia*. Routlidge

Besier, G. & Stokłosa, K. (ed.) (2014) *European Border Regions in Comparison: Overcoming Nationalistic Aspects or Re-Nationalization?*, 1st Edition. Routledge.

Bohi, D. R. & Toman, M. A. (1996) Economics of Energy Security. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Buzan, B & Wæver, O. & de Wilde J. (1998) *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Buzan, B. Wæver, O. (2003) *Regions and powers: The structure of international security*. Campridge University press

Cherp, A. & Jewell, J. (2014). “The concept of energy security: Beyond the four As.” *Energy Policy*, Volume 75, December 2014, pp. 415–421 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421514004960.

Corry, O. (2012) “Securitisation and ‘Riskification’: Second-order Security and the Politics of Climate Change.” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Volume 40, Issue 2. January 2012.

Ćwiek-Karpowicz, J. (2012) “Poland’s energy security: between German nuclear phase-out and energy dependency from Russia.” *International Issues & Slovak Foreign Policy Affairs*, Volume XXI, Issue 1–2, 2012, pp. 44–55.

Der Spiegel online international (2014) “Dancing with the Bear Merkel Seeks a Hardline on Putin.” 24 March 2014. Available at: http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/merkel-and-europe-search-for-an-adequate-response-to-putin-a-960378.html. Accessed: 25 October 2018

Deutsch, K. W. & Burrell, S. A. & Kann, R. A. & Lee, M. (1957) *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*. Princeton University Press.

Deutsche wirtschafts nachrichten (2015) “German economy demands immediate stop of Russia sanctions.” 26 June 2015, Available at: https://deutsche-wirtschafts-nachrichten.de/2015/06/26/deutsche-wirtschaft-fordert-sofortigen-stopp-der-russland-sanktionen/. Accessed: 26 October 2018

Deutscher Bundestag (2014) “Chancellor Merkel threatens Russia with sanctions.” 13 March 2014. Available at :https://www.bundestag.de/dokumente/textarchiv/2014/49865952_kw11_de_regierungserklaerung_ukraine/216288. Accessed: 25 October 2018

Deutscher Bundestag (2015) “Antwort der Bundesregierung.” Drucksache 18/6526,” 02.11.2015, Available at: http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/18/065/1806526.pdf. Accessed: 27 October 2018

Duffield, J. (2009) “Germany and energy security in the 2000s: Rise and fall of a policy issue?” *Energy Policy.* Volume 37. Issue 11. pp.4284–4292

Dyson, T. (2016) “Energy Security and Germany’s Response to Russian Revisionism: The Dangers of Civilian Power.” *German Politics*, Volume 25, Issue 4. 10 February 2016. pp. 500–518.

Eduskunta (2014) “Minutes of the plenary session 93/2014 vp.” 7 October 2014. Available at: https://www.eduskunta.fi/FI/vaski/sivut/trip.aspx?triptype=ValtiopaivaAsiakirjat&docid=PTK+93/2014+ke+p+1. Accessed: 12 October 2018

Eduskunta (2016) “Committee report. UaVM92016 vp - VNS 6/2016 vp.” September 2016. Available at: https://www.eduskunta.fi/FI/vaski/Mietinto/Sivut/UaVM_9+2016.aspx. Accessed: 5 November 2018

European Commission (1968) “First Guidelines for a Community Energy Policy.” COM(68)1050 (18 December 1968)

European Commission (2000) “Green Paper: Towards a European Strategy for the Security of Energy Supply.” COM(2000)769 (29 November 2000)

European Commission (2014a) “2030 Climate and energy framework.” Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/strategies/2030_en.

European Commission (2014b) “Energy security strategy.” Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics/energy-strategy-and-energy-union/energy-security-strategy. Accessed: 15 October 2018

European Commission (2015a) “Energy Union Package. A Framework Strategy for a Resilient Energy Union with a Forward-Looking Climate Change Policy.” Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/energy/sites/ener/files/publication/FOR%20WEB%20energyunion_with%20_annex_en.pdf. Accessed: 15 October 2018

European Commission (2015b) “Commission launches plan for Energy Union.” 25 February 2015. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/news/commission-launches-plan-energy-union. Accessed: 10 October 2018

European Commission. “Building the Energy Union.” Available at : https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics/energy-strategy-and-energy-union/building-energy-union. Accessed: 6 November 2018

European Council of Foreign Relations. “Foreign policy scorecard 2015.” Available at: www.ecfr.eu/scorecard/2015. Accessed: 25 October 2018

European parliament (2009) “3rd Energy Package gets final approval from MEPs.” 29 April 2009. Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+IM-PRESS+20080616FCS31737+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN. Accessed: 15 October 2018

Eurostat. EU imports. Available at : https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/infographs/energy/bloc-2c.html. Accessed: 27 October 2018

Eurostat. Statistics explained. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Energy_production_and_imports. Accessed: 2 November 2018

Faas, H. & Gheorghe, A. V.(ed.) (2011) “European Security—A European Perspective.” *Energy Security: International and Local Issues, Theoretical Perspectives, and Critical Energy Infrastructures*, Springer.

Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear safety. German climate policy. Available at: https://www.cop23.de/en/bmu/german-climate-policy/. Accessed: 20 October 2018

Fennovoima. “The story of Fennovoima.” Available at: https://fennovoima.fi/fennovoima/fennovoiman-tarina. Accessed: 2 November 2018

Finnish Government (2017) “Finland among the front-runners at international climate summit.” *Government communication department*, Press release 588/2017. 12 December 2017. Available at: https://valtioneuvosto.fi/en/article/-/asset_publisher/10616/suomi-edellakavijoiden-joukossa-kansainvalisessa-ilmastokokouksessa. Accessed: 2 November 2018

Finnish Security Intelligence Service (2015) “2015 report.” Available at: https://www.supo.fi/instancedata/prime_product_julkaisu/intermin/embeds/supowwwstructure/67074_2015_Supo_ENG.pdf?cb0cc853f98ed588. Accessed: 7 October 2018

Fischer, S. (2015) “Searching for an Energy Union, Policy perspectives.” *CSS ETH Zurich*. Volume 3, Issue. 5. November 2015. Available at: http://www.css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/pdfs/PP3-5.pdf

Forsberg, T (2014) “Finland's Coping Strategy.” *Parliament of Finland, committee for the Future.* Publications of the Committee for the Future, no. 9/2014. Available at: https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/152816/russia_as_a_neighbour.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y. Accessed: 10 October 2018

Fortum (2018) “Fortum closes public takeover offer on Uniper.” 26 June 2018. Available at: https://www.fortum.com/media/2018/06/fortum-closes-public-takeover-offer-uniper. Accessed: 15 October 2018

Gawlikowska-Fyk, A. (2018) “Germany’s Energiewende: No Abandonment, Just Revision.” *The Polish Institute of International Affairs*, 25. January 2018. Bulletin no. 13 (1084).

Gazprom ‘Nord Stream 2: “A new export gas pipeline running from Russia to Europe across the Baltic Sea.” Available at: http://www.gazprom.com/projects/nord-stream2/. Accessed: 25 October 2018

Genschel, P. & Jachtenfuchs, M. (2016) “More integration, less federation: the European integration of core state powers.” *Journal of European Public Policy*, Volume 23, Issue 1, pp. 42–59.

German government (2015). German non-paper on the Energy Union. Available at: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bzzk5QQezBErTFNQQ2ZjMVpBYUU/view. Accessed: 2 November 2018

Gloystein, H. (2011) “UPDATE 1-Nord Stream to finish 1st gas pipeline Thursday.” *Reuters*, 4 May 2011. Available at: https://uk.reuters.com/article/europe-gas-pipeline/update-1-nord-stream-to-finish-1st-gas-pipeline-thursday-idUKLDE7431M720110504. Accessed: 24 October 2018

Guzzini, S. (2012) “Social mechanisms as micro-dynamics in cosntructivist analysis.“ *The Return of Geopolitics in Europe? Social Mechanisms and Foreign Policy Identity Crises*. Cambridge University Press.

Hay, C. (2011) “Interpreting interpretivism interpreting interpretations: The new hermeneutics of public administration.” *Public Administration*, Volume 89, Issue 1, pp. 167–82.

Heinrich, A. & Kusznir, J. & Lis, A. & Pleines, H. & Smith, K. & Szulecki, K. (2016) “Towards a common EU energy policy? Debates on energy security in Poland and Germany.” *ESPRI policy paper 02/2016*. September 2016. Available at: https://www.forschungsstelle.uni-bremen.de/UserFiles/file/ESPRI_Policy_Paper_2_2016.pdf. Accessed: 2 November 2018

Humphreys, J. (2014) “Russia sanctions: Who will be hurt the most?” *BBC*, 30 July 2014. Available at: https://www.bbc.com/news/business-28539928. Accessed: 23 October 2018

IEA country statistics. Available at: https://www.iea.org/statistics/?country=WORLD&year=2016&category=Key%20indicators&indicator=TPESbySource&mode=chart&categoryBrowse=false&dataTable=BALANCES&showDataTable=false

Interfax-Ukraine (2012) “Nord Stream seeks to study Estonian economic zone in Baltic until 2015” *Kyivpost*, 27 August 2012. Available at: https://www.kyivpost.com/article/content/russia/nord-stream-seeks-to-study-estonian-economic-zone-in-baltic-until-2015-312086.html. Accessed: 23 October 2018

International Energy Agency (2013a) “Energy policies of IEA countries: Finland, 2013 review.” Available at: https://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/Finland2013_free.pdf. Accessed: 16 September 2018

International Energy Agency (2013b) “Energy Policies of IEA countries Germany. 2013 Review.” Available at: https://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/Germany2013_free.pdf. Accessed: 21 September 2018

International Energy Agency (2014a) “Energy Policies of IEA Countries. 2014 Review: European Union 2014.” Available at: https://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/EuropeanUnion_2014.pdf. Accessed: 5 November 2018

International Energy Agency (2014b) “Energy supply security: Emergency Response of IEA Countries 2014.” Available at: https://webstore.iea.org/energy-supply-security-the-emergency-response-of-iea-countries-2014. Accessed: 16 September 2018

International Energy Agency (2016) “Energy Policies of IEA Countries Poland 2016 Review.” Available at: https://www.teraz-srodowisko.pl/media/pdf/aktualnosci/3088-energy-policies-of-iea-countries-poland-2016.pdf. Accessed: 25 September 2018

International Energy Agency. “Policies and measures: Energy Concept. 22 June 2015.” Available at: https://www.iea.org/policiesandmeasures/pams/germany/name-34991-en.php. Accessed: 21 October 2018

International Energy Agency. “Policies and measures: Integrated Climate Change and Energy Programme.” Available at: https://www.iea.org/policiesandmeasures/pams/germany/name-23939-en.php. Accessed: 22 October 2018

Iso-Markku, T (2015) “The Eastern Neighbors and Russia: Russia as a difficult, but indispensable partner.” *EU-28 Watch*, No.11 October 2015. Available at: http://eu-28watch.org/issues/issue-no-11/finland/. Accessed: 12 October 2018

Jakóbik, W. (2018) “The Energy Union is still attractive for Poland.” *Financial Observer*, 22 January 2018. Available at: https://financialobserver.eu/poland/the-energy-union-is-still-attractive-for-poland/. Accessed: 6 November 2018.

Judge, A. & Maltby, T. (2017). “European Energy Union? Caught between securitization and ‘riskification’.” *European Journal of International Security*, Volume. 2, Issue 2, pp. 179–202. 9 May 2017.

Kajova, A. (2015) “Defense minister Niinistö ‘’Russia is not a direct threat”.” *Iltalehti*, 9 August 2015. Available at: https://www.iltalehti.fi/uutiset/2015080920150063_uu.shtml. Accessed: 5 November 2018

Katzenstein, P. J. (2000) “Regionalism and Asia.” *Journal: New Political Economy*, Volume 5, Issue 3, 2000. pp. 353–368.

Keay, M. & Buchan, D. (2015) “Europe’s Energy Union: a problem of governance.” *Oxford Institute for energy studies*. University of Oxford. November 2015. Available at: https://www.oxfordenergy.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Europes-Energy-Union-a-problem-of-governance.pdf. Accessed: 6 November 2018

Kirchner, E. (2010) “European Energy Security Co-operation: Between Amity and Enmity.” *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Volume 48, Issue 4, September 2010. pp. 859–880

Kirschbaum, E. (2014) “Putin's apologist? Germany's Schroeder says they're just friends.” *Reuters*. 27 March 2014. Available at : https://www.reuters.com/article/us-ukraine-russia-schroeder/putins-apologist-germanys-schroeder-says-theyre-just-friends-idUSBREA2Q16220140327. Accessed: 24 October 2018

Koeth, W. (2016) “Leadership Revised. How Did the Ukraine Crisis and the Annexation of Crimea Affirm Germany’s Leading Role in EU Foreign Policy?” *Lithuanian Annual Strategic Review*,

Volume 14, Issue 1. pp. 101–116. Available at: https://content.sciendo.com/view/journals/lasr/14/1/article-p101.xml. Accessed: 21 October 2018

Krumm, R. & Schröder, H. & Medvedev, S. (ed) (2012) "The Rise of Realism: Germany's Perception of Russia from Gorbachev to Medvedev." *Constructing Identities in Europe: German and Russian. 2012*. pp. 114–124

Kurki-Suonio, J. (2018) "Conservative MEP's give a stern opinion "Nord Stream 2 should not be built"." *Uusi Suomi*, 12 January 2018. Available at: https://www.uusisuomi.fi/kotimaa/239232-kokoomuksen-mepeilta-vahva-kanta-nord-stream-2sta-ei-pitaisi-rakentaa. Accessed: 13 October 2018

Länkinen, T. (2013) "Fennovoima chooses Rosatom." *Yle*, 21 December 2013. Available at: https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-6997356. Accessed: 25 October 2018

Larrabee, S. F & Pezard, S. & Radin, A. & Chandler, N. & Crane, K. & Szayna, T. S. (2017) "Russia & the West After the Ukrainian Crisis: European Vulnerabilities to Russian Pressures." *Rand Corporation*, 9 February 2017.

Loikkanen, J. (2016) "Rehn: The collapse of Fennovoima nuclear power plant project was very close." *MTV Uutiset*, 23 April 2016. Available at: https://www.mtvuutiset.fi/artikkeli/rehn-fennovoiman-ydinvoimalahankkeen-kaatuminen-oli-hyvin-lahella/5856860#gs._DolAMY. Accessed: 13 October 2018

Madajczyk, P. (2015) "Confrontation and cooperation: 1000 Years of Polish-German-Russian Relations. Germany towards the crisis in Ukraine". *Kolegium Jagiellonskie Torunska Szkola Wyzsza. Polish Academy of Sciences*, Volume 2, 2015. pp. 22–26

Majone, G. (1994) "The Rise of the Regulatory State in Europe." *Journal of West European Politics*, Volume 17, Issue 3: The State in Western Europe retreat or Redefinition? pp. 77–101

Maltby, T. (2013) "European Union energy policy integration: a case of European Commission policy entrepreneurship and increasing supranationalism." *Energy Policy*, Volume 55, April 2013, pp. 435–444

Marco S. (2016) "The EU's Energy Union: A Sustainable Path to Energy Security?" *The International Spectator*, 51:1, 131-144, DOI: 10.1080/03932729.2016.1090827. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/03932729.2016.1090827. Accessed: 15 October 2018

Martewicz, M. (2018) "Poland Waves Goodbye to Russian Gas After 74 Years." *Bloomberg*, 8 February 2018. Available at: https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-02-08/poland-bets-on-lng-norwegian-gas-as-divorce-with-russia-looms. Accessed: 28 October 2018

Martikainen, T. & Vihma, A. (2016) "Dividing the Eu with Energy? Unpacking Russia's Energy Geoeconomics." *FIIA (the Finnish Institute of international affairs,)* Briefing paper 191. March 2016

Matalucci, S. (2015) "Gazprom Signs Deals with E.ON, OMV, Shell for New Pipeline to Germany." *Natural Gas Europe*, 18.6.2015. Available at: https://www.naturalgasworld.com/gazprom-signs-deals-with-e.on-omv-shell-for-new-pipe-to-germany-24262. Accessed: 1 November 2018

Matúš, M. (2016) "Energy Union: Towards a Common EU Energy Policy?" *European Union Centre of Excellence Policy Briefs*, University of Alberta, Number 1, 2016 Available at: https://cloudfront.ualberta.ca/-/media/eucentre/pdfs/policy-briefs/matus-misikenergy-unionnew.pdf. Accessed: 3 November 2018

Mazneva, E. (2015) "Russia Plans to End Ukraine Gas Transit for New Route After 2019." *Bloomberg*, April 13 April 2015, Available at: http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-04-13/russia-plans-to-end-ukraine-gastransit-for-new-route-after-2019. Accessed: 15 October 2018

McGowan, F. & Wallace, H. (1996) "Towards a European regulatory state." *Journal of European Public Policy*. Volume 3, Issue 4. pp.560–576.

McGowan, F. (2011) "Putting energy insecurity into historical context: European Responses to the Energy Crises of the 1970s and 2000s." *Geopolitics*, Volume 16, Issue 3, August 2011.

Meister, S. (2013) “Germany’s Russia Policy under Angela Merkel: A Balance sheet.” *The Polish Quarterly of International Affairs,* Volume 22, Issue 2, 1 April 2013

Ministry Economic affairs and Employment. “Reserve stocks and preparedness planning secure energy supply.” Available at: https://tem.fi/en/security-of-energy-supply. Accessed: 15 October 2018

Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Finland (2016). “Statement, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.” 21 June 2016. Available at: http://tem.fi/documents/1410877/2616019/Ulkoministeri%C3%B6n+lausunto.pdf. Accessed. 4 November 2018

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (2015) “Review on Finland’s security cooperation.” 3/2015. *Publications of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.* Available at : https://um.fi/documents/35732/48132/review_on_finland_s_security_cooperation

Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment (2013a) “National climate and energy strategy.” Available at: https://tem.fi/documents/1410877/2769658/National+Energy+and+Climate+Strategy+2013/630dc2c6-4a23-4f2e-b304-3cd69daf8265. Accessed: 16 September 2018

Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment (2013b) “Overview of the updated Climate and Energy Strategy in 2013 continued.” Available at: https://tem.fi/documents/1410877/2626968/Kansallinen+energia-+ja+ilmastostrategian+taustaraportti.pdf/51445cd7-2e89-44dc-a0d3-45cbd6ffa8da. Accessed in 17 September 2018

Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment, (2013c) “National Energy and Climate Strategy Government Report to Parliament on 20 March 2013.” Available at: https://tem.fi/documents/1410877/2769658/National+Energy+and+Climate+Strategy+2013/630dc2c6-4a23-4f2e-b304-3cd69daf8265. Accessed: 23 October 2018

Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment (2015) “a Report on energy policy alternatives.” *Publications of the Ministry of Employment and the Economy*. *Energy and climate 25/2015*. Available at: https://tem.fi/documents/1410877/2628109/Virkamiesselvitys+energiapolitiikan+vaihtoehdoista.pdf/2202f950-da88-4d90-a3b5-9d4fbdb3c7c7. Accessed: 22 October 2018

Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment (2017) “Government report on the National Energy and Climate Strategy for 2030.” Available at: http://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/handle/10024/79189. Accessed: 17 September 2018

Ministry of Economic affairs and Employment (2018) “Government approval for the Nord Stream 2 gas pipeline project.” 5 April 2018. Available at: https://tem.fi/artikkeli/-/asset_publisher/valtioneuvostolta-suostumus-nord-stream-2-kaasuputkihankkeelle. Accessed: 16 October 2018

Ministry of Economy (2009) “Energy Policy of Poland until 2030.” *Appendix to Resolution no. 202/2009 of the Council of Ministers of 10 November 2009*. Available at: https://climateobserver.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Poland_EPP-2030-2009.pdf. Accessed: 4 November 2018

Ministry of Economy (2014) “The Polish Energy Policy project until 2050.” August 2014. Available at: http://gramwzielone.pl/uploads/files/Projekt%20PEP%202050.pdf. Accessed: 8 November 2018

MTV (2017) “Sipilä: “Fortum’s Uniper purchase does not have foreign- or security policy dimensions.” 14 October 2017. Available at: https://www.mtvuutiset.fi/artikkeli/sipila-fortumin-uniper-kaupassa-ei-ole-ulko-ja-turvallisuuspoliittisia-ulottuvuuksia/6617974#gs.g=EbmT4. Accessed: 13 October 2018

Natorski, M. & Herranz-Surrallés, A. (2008) “Securitizing moves to nowhere?” *Journal of contemporary European Research*, Volume 4, Issue 2, July 2008. pp.70–89. Available at: https://www.jcer.net/index.php/jcer/article/view/88. Accessed: 16October 2018

Niemelä, J. & Huhta, K. (2008) "Baltic Sea gas pipe project meets large difficulties." *Helsingin Sanomat*, 10 March 2008. Available at: https://www.hs.fi/kotimaa/art-2000004554181.html. Accessed: 20 October 2018

Nord Stream: Facts and Figures. Available at: https://web.archive.org/web/20110104181103/http://www.nord-stream.com/en/the-pipeline/facts-figures.html. Accessed: 23 October 2018

Nordpool. Available at: https://www.nordpoolgroup.com/. Accessed: 15 October 2018

Nyman, J. (2013). *Ethics, securitization and energy security: the case of the United States*. 8th Pan-European Conference on International Relations. Warsaw.

Nyman, J. (2014) "Red storm ahead: Securitisation of energy in US-China relations." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Volume 43, Issue 1 pp. 43–65.

Oliver, C. (2015) "EU Fails to Agree New Russia 'Sanctions." *Financial Times*, 29 January 2015, Available at: https://www.ft.com/content/e95231f6-a7ae-11e4-8e78-00144feab7de. Accessed: 24 October 2018

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2016), "OECD Economic Surveys, Poland 2016." *OECD Publishing*, Paris. Available at: https://www.oecd.org/eco/surveys/Poland-2016-overview.pdf. Accessed: 6 November 2018

Ost-Ausschuss - Osteuropaverein der Deutschen Wirtschaf (2015) "Wolfgang Büchele is the new chairman of the East Committee of German Business." 11 November 2015. Available at: https://www.oaoev.de/node/1008. Accessed: 25 October 2018

Paraskova, T. (2018) "Poland Reduces Russian Oil Import Dependence, At A Cost." *Oilprice.com*. 9 May 2018. Available at: https://oilprice.com/Latest-Energy-News/World-News/Poland-Reduces-Russian-Oil-Import-Dependence-At-A-Cost.html. Accessed: 4 November 2018

Pointvogl, A. (2009) "Perceptions, realities, concession--What is driving the integration of European energy policies?" *Energy Policy*, Volume 37, Issue 12, December 2009, pp.5704–5716

Poland's Public Opinion Research Center (CBOS). Available at: https://sucha24.pl/wydarzenia/item/5684-ranking-najbardziej-szanowanych-zawodow-pierwsze-miejsce-dla-strazaka-dziwi-zawod-plasujacy-sie-w-koncowce-rankingu

Polish Government (2014) "Minister Grzegorz Schetyna on Polish foreign policy priorities." *Ministry of Foreign Affairs*, 6 November 2014. Available at: https://www.msz.gov.pl/en/news/minister_grzegorz_schetyna_on_Polish_foreign_policy_priorities. Accessed: 8 November 2018

Polish Information and Foreign Investment Agency (2011) "Energy Sector in Poland." Available at: https://www.paih.gov.pl/files/?id_plik=19610. Accessed: 2 November 2018

Polish Parliament (2013) "Act of July 26, 2013 amending the Energy Law Act and some other acts." *Journal of laws*, 2013, item 984, 27 August 2013. Available at: http://prawo.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/DocDetails.xsp?id=WDU20130000984. Accessed: 1 November 2018

Polska (2015) "Polish PM signs Paris Agreement." 23 April 2016. Available at: https://polska.pl/politics/foreign-affairs/Polish-pm-signs-paris-agreement/. Accessed: 2 November 2018

Pop, A. (2016) "From cooperation to confrontation: the impact of bilateral perceptions and interactions on the EU-Russia relations in the context of shared neighborhood." *Eastern Journal of European Studies*, Volume 7, Issue 2, December 2016. pp. 47–70

Prime Minister's Office Finland (2013) "Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2012. Government Report." *Prime Minister's Office Publications* 1/2013. Available at: https://vm.fi/documents/10616/1093242/J0113_FinnishSecurity_net.pdf/f7d0b3db-f566-4d32-af19-68a7064e24ee?version=1.0

Prime Minister's Office Finland (2015a) “Finland, a land of solutions – strategic programme of Prime Minister Juha Sipilä's Government.” 29 May 2015. Available at: https://valtioneuvosto.fi/documents/10184/1427398/Ratkaisujen+Suomi_EN_YHDISTETTY_netti.pdf/8d2e1a66-e24a-4073-8303-ee3127fbfcac. Accessed: 15 October 2018

Prime Minister’s Office Finland (2015b) “Prime Minister Juha Sipilä’s speech during a topical parliamentary discussion on foreign policy 20 October 2015.” *Government Communications Department.* 20.10.2015. Available at: https://vnk.fi/en/sipila/prime-minister/-/asset_publisher/paaministeri-juha-sipilan-puheenvuoro-eduskunnan-ulkopoliittisessa-ajankohtaiskeskustelussa-20-10-2015. Accessed: 14 October 2018

Prime Minister’s Office Finland (2016) “Government Report on Finnish Foreign and security Policy, 9/2016.” *Prime Minister’s Office Publications*

Puka, L. & Szulecki, K. (2014) “The politics and economics of cross-border electricity infrastructure: A framework for analysis.” *Energy Research and Social Science*, Volume 4. December 2014. pp.124–134.

Pynnöniemi, K. & Saari, S. (2017) “Hybrid influence – lessons from Finland.” *Nato Review magazine*, 28 June 2017. Available at: https://www.nato.int/docu/review/2017/also-in-2017/lessons-from-finland-influence-russia-policty-security/en/index.htm. Accessed: 2 October 2018

Radio Free Europe (2018) “Polish PM Calls Nord Stream 2 'Weapon' Of Hybrid Warfare’”. 28 May 2018. Available at: https://www.rferl.org/a/Polish-pm-calls-nord-stream-2-weapon-of-hybrid-warfare/29255392.html. Accessed: 7 November 2018

Reuters (2014) “Polish PM: EU should form energy union to secure supplies.” 29 March 2014. Available at: https://uk.reuters.com/article/poland-energy/Polish-pm-eu-should-form-energy-union-to-secure-supplies-idUKL5N0MQ05X20140329. Accessed: 8 November 2018

Reuters (2014). “Donald Tusk on the Polish project of the European Energy Union.” 29 March 2014. Available at: https://uk.reuters.com/article/poland-energy/Polish-pm-eu-should-form-energy-union-to-secure-supplies-idUKL5N0MQ05X20140329

Rhys, J. (2013) “Current German energy policy – the Energiewende: A UK and climate change perspective.” Oxford energy comment, *Oxford institute for energy studies* 4. 2013. Available at: https://www.oxfordenergy.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Current-German-Energy-Policy-A-UK-and-climate-concern-perspective.pdf. Accessed: 22 October 2018

Roadmap towards an Energy Union for Europe. Non-paper addressing the EU’s energy dependency challenges (2014) Available at: https://www.msz.gov.pl/resource/34efc44a-3b67-4f5e-b360-ad7c71082604:JCR. Accessed: 5 November 2018

Röhrkasten, S. & Westphal, K. (2012) “Energy security and the transatlantic dimension: a view from Germany.” German Institute for International and Security Affairs. *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, Volume 10, Issue 4, December 2012. pp. 328–342

Russell, R. & Wettengel, J. (2017) “Germany's Energiewende: The Easy Guide Find your way around the energy transition.” *Clean Energy Wire*, 4 August 2017. Available at: https://www.cleanenergywire.org/dossiers/germanys-Energiewende-easy-guide. Accessed: 18 October 2018

Salter, M. B. (2008) “Securitization and desecuritization: A dramaturgical analysis of the Canadian air transport security authority.” *Journal of International Relations and Development*, Volume 11, Issue 4, December 2008, pp.321–349. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1057/jird.2008.20

Sattich, T. (2016) “Energy Imports, Geoeconomics, and Regional Coordination: The Case of Germany and Poland in the Baltic Energy System - Close Neighbours, Close(r) Cooperation?” *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, Volume 6, Issue 4, pp. 789–800.

Schroeder, G. (2007) “Wandel durch Verflechtung.” *Der Spiegel*, 21.5.2007. Available at: http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-51644671. Accessed: 20 October2018

Shaffer, B. (2009) *Energy politics*. Taylor & Francis

Siddi, M. (2015) "The EU–Russia Gas Relationship: New Projects, New Disputes?" *FIIA Briefing Paper 183*. October 2015, Finnish Institute of International Affairs. Available at: https://storage.googleapis.com/upi-live/2017/01/bp183.pdf. Accessed: 25 October 2018

Siddi, M (2016a) "The EU's Energy Union: A Sustainable Path to Energy Security?" *The International Spectator*, Volume 5, Issue 1. 1 April 2016. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301703308_The_EU's_Energy_Union_A_Sustainable_Path_to_Energy_Security. Accessed: 26 October 2018

Siddi, M (2016b) "German Foreign Policy towards Russia in the Aftermath of the Ukraine Crisis: A New Ostpolitik?" *Europe-Asia Studies*, Volume 68, Issue 4. 3 June 2016. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09668136.2016.1173879?journalCode=ceas20. Accessed: 30 October 2018

Sikorski, R. (2014) "Foreign Ministers of V4 Nordic and Baltic Countries Meet in Narva." *Ministry of Foreign Affairs*. 7 March 2014. Available at: https://www.msz.gov.pl/en/foreign_policy/europe/visegrad_group/foreign_ministers_of_v4__nordic_and_baltic_countries_meet_in_narva;jsessionid=61007A0B70B98CDC87062F6D57E10EB0.cmsap1p. Accessed: 8 November 2018

Skjærseth, J. B. (2014) "Polish brake pad." *Energi og klima*. 10 October 2014. Available at: https://energiogklima.no/kommentar/polsk-bremsekloss/. Accessed: 6 November 2018

Skjærseth, J. B. (2014). "Implementing EU climate and energy policies in Poland: From Europeanization to Polonization?" *FNI Report 8/2014*. Lysaker: Fridtjof Nansen Institute

Sovacool, B. K. & Mukherjee, I. & Drupardy, I. M. & D'Agostino, A. L. (2011) "Evaluating Energy Security Performance from 1990 to 2010 for Eighteen Countries." *Energy*, Volume 36, Issue 10. pp. 5846–5853

Sovacool, B. K. & Mukherjee, I. (2011). "Conceptualizing and measuring energy security: A synthesized approach." *Energy*, Volume 36, Issue 8, pp: 5343–5355. Available at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/soss_research/2512

Spiegel Online (2011) "Controversial Project Launched: Merkel and Medvedev Open Baltic Gas Pipeline." 8 November 2011. Available at: http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/controversial-project-launched-merkel-and-medvedev-open-baltic-gas-pipeline-a-796611.html. Accessed: 24 October 2018

Statistics Finland. Available at; http://www.stat.fi/til/vrm_en.html

Steinhauser. G (2015) "Germany's Merkel Defends Russian Gas Pipeline Plan." *Wall Street Journal*, 18.12.2015, Available at: https://www.wsj.com/articles/germanys-merkel-defends-russian-gas-pipeline-plan-1450447499. Accessed: 29 October 2018

Stritzel, H. (2007) "Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and beyond." *European Journal of International Relations.* Volume 13, Issue 3, September 2007.

Szulecki, K. & Fischer, S. & Gullberg, A. T. & Sartor, O. (2016) "Shaping the 'Energy Union': between national positions and governance innovation in EU energy and climate policy." *Climate policy journal*, Volume 6, Issue 5. pp. 548–567. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14693062.2015.1135100. Accessed. 6 November 2018.

Szulecki, K. (2017) *When energy becomes security: Copenhagen School meets energy studies University of Oslo.*

Szulecki, K. (2018) *Energy Security in Europe. Divergent Perceptions and Policy Challenges*. University of Oslo. Palgrave Macmillan

Taloussanomat (2014): "Fennovoima nuclear power plant back to parliament." 4 March, 2014. Available at: https://www.is.fi/taloussanomat/art-2000001828356.html. Accessed: 3rd November 2018

The Chancellery of the Prime Minister (2014) “Donald Tusk in Brussels on energy security in Europe.” 21 May 2014. Available at: https://www.premier.gov.pl/wydarzenia/aktualnosci/donald-tusk-w-brukseli-o-bezpieczenstwie-energetycznym-europy.html. Accessed: 8 November 2018

The Green paper: A European Strategy for Sustainable, Competitive and Secure Energy. 2006 http://europa.eu/documents/comm/green_papers/pdf/com2006_105_en.pdf

The Guardian (2015) “Ukraine crisis will not be solved by military means, says Angela Merkel.” 7 February 2015. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/feb/07/ukraine-crisis-will-not-be-solved-by-military-means-says-angela-merkel. Accessed: 26 October 2018

The President of the Energy Regulatory Office in Poland (2013) “National report 2013.” Available at: file:///C:/Users/O/Downloads/National_Report_2013%20(1).pdf. Accessed: 2 November 2018

The President of the Republic of Finland (2012) “Speech by President of the Republic of Finland Sauli Niinistö at the festive Bellevue Palace hosted by German President Joachim Gauck in Berlin on 8 November 2012.” Available at: http://www.tpk.fi/public/default.aspx?contentlan=1&culture=fi-FI&nodeid=44810&contentid=262143&x=9&y=9. Accessed: 2 November 2018

The President of the Republic of Finland (2014) “President Niinistö meets the Foreign Minister of Russia Sergei Lavrov.” 10 June 2014. Available at: http://www.presidentti.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=307728&nodeid=44809&contentlan=2&culture=en-US. Accessed: 12 October 2018

Toplensky, R. (2017) “Tusk adds voice to calls for greater EU control over Nord Stream 2.” *Financial times*. 5 June 2017. Available at: https://www.ft.com/content/509eaa34-49dc-11e7-919a-1e14ce4af89b. Accessed: 7 November 2018

Tynkkynen, V. & Pynnöniemi, K. & Höysniemi, S. (2017) “Global energy transitions and Russia’s energy influence in Finland.” *Aleksanteri Institute*. Policy Brief 19/2017.

Uusi Suomi (2017) “Sauli Niinistö to Yle: “If we are taking about the threat of war, there is none to be seen in Finland””. Available at: https://www.uusisuomi.fi/kotimaa/236587-sauli-niinisto-ylella-jos-puhutaan-sodan-uhasta-sellaista-ei-ole-suomessa-nakyvissa. Accessed: 5 November 2018

Vinik, D. (2014) “Why Germany Doesn't Want Sanctions Against Russia, in Two Chart.” *The New Republic*. 3 March 2014. Available at: https://newrepublic.com/article/116836/why-germany-doesnt-want-sanction-russia-invading-ukraine. Accessed: 25 October 2018

Wæver, O. (1999) “Securitizing Sectors? Reply to Eriksson.” *Cooperation and Conflict*, Volume 34, Issue 3, pp. 334–340.

Wigell, M. & Vihma, A. (2016) “Geopolitics versus geoeconomics: the case of Russia’s geostrategy and its effects on the EU.” *International Affairs*, Volume 92, Issue 3, pp.605–627 May 2016,

World Nuclear News (2014) “Fortum ready to take minority stake in Fennovoima nuclear project.” 2 December 2014. Available at: http://world-nuclear-news.org/Articles/Fortum-ready-to-take-minority-stake-in-Fennovoima. Accessed: 14 October 2018

World Population Review. Available at: http://worldpopulationreview.com/. Accessed: 15 September 2018

Ydersbond, I. M. & Sveen, T. B. (2014) “The Ukraine Crisis and European energy system transformation.” *Cicep*, 10 November 2014. Available at:http://www.cicep.no/aktuelt/2015/10/15/the-ukraine-crisis-and-european-energy-system-transformation. Accessed: 6 November 2018

Yergin, D. (1988) “Energy Security in the 1990s.” *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 67, issue. 1, Published by: Council on Foreign Relations

Yergin, D. (2006) “Ensuring Energy Security.” *Foreign affairs*, Volume 85, Issue. 2, Published by: Council on Foreign Relations

Yle (2010) “Katainen: The need for nuclear power should be clearly stated.” Published 29 March 2010. Updated: 3 June 2013. Available at: https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-5535787. Accessed: 23 October 2018

Yle (2014) “Green Party votes unanimously to leave government.” 20 September 2014. Available at: https://yle.fi/uutiset/osasto/news/green_party_votes_unanimously_to_leave_government/7482977. Accessed: 15 November 2018

Yle (2015) “Stubb: Russia is not a security policy threat.” 14 January 2015. Available at: https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-7737671. Accessed. 5 November 2018

Youngs, R. (2009) *Energy Security: Europe's New Foreign Policy Challenge.* Routledge

Zajaczkowski, J. (2017) “Trading solidarity for security? Poland and the Russian-Ukrainian crisis.” *Foundation for Good Politics*. Available at: https://ideopol.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/1.7.ENG.-Polish-Responses%20Final.pdf. Accessed: 5 November 2018.